Dark Radiation

Jörn Kersten

University of Bergen & KIAS

June 13, 2022

Outline

Effects of Dark Radiation

- Definitions
- Big Bang Nucleosynthesis
- Cosmic Microwave Background
- Impact on Hubble tension

Model Building Aspects

- Dark Matter Interacting with Itself and Dark Radiation
- Dark Radiation from Decays

3 Possible Future Directions

Lecture notes: https://ihepco.yonsei.ac.kr/event/192/

- Radiation in cosmological context = relativistic particles ($p = \rho/3$)
- Expansion → redshift → radiation can become (non-relativistic) matter (p = 0) eventually → equivalent to hot dark matter
- BBN, CMB: $T \sim$ 0.1 MeV..0.1 eV \rightsquigarrow radiation in SM: γ, ν
- Dark: not in SM

 \rightsquigarrow Dark Radiation (DR): relativistic particles $\neq \gamma$, SM ν

- Examples
 - (Light) sterile neutrino (fermion)
 - Dark photon (vector)

Parameterized via radiation energy density

$$\rho_{\rm rad} = \rho_{\gamma} + \rho_{\nu} + \rho_{\rm DR} \equiv \left[1 + N_{\rm eff} \, \frac{7}{8} \left(\frac{T_{\nu}}{T}\right)^4\right] \rho_{\gamma}$$

• $T \equiv T_{\gamma}$

- N_{eff}: effective number of neutrino species
- Standard Model: NSM_{eff} = 3.0440 ± 0.0002 Bennett et al., JCAP 04 (2021)
- Existence of dark radiation $\Leftrightarrow \Delta N_{\text{eff}} \equiv N_{\text{eff}} N_{\text{eff}}^{\text{SM}} > 0$







2203.06142

- Tensions in Λ CDM (H_0 , S_8 , small scale structure, ...)
- Neutrino oscillation anomalies ~> light sterile neutrinos?
- Dark sectors for physics BSM, lack of evidence for new EW-scale particles ~→ light new states?

Suppressing Dwarfs by Late Kinetic Decoupling

- Dark Matter χ , $m_{\chi} \sim$ TeV or GeV
- Dark Radiation N, $m_N \lesssim eV$
- Dark photon V couples to both, $m_V \sim \text{MeV}$

Suppressing Dwarfs by Late Kinetic Decoupling

- Dark Matter χ , $m_{\chi} \sim$ TeV or GeV
- Dark Radiation N, m_N ≤ eV
- Dark photon V couples to both, m_V ~ MeV
- Dark Matter self-interactions ~> most small-scale problems solved
- Dark Radiation free-streaming → σ₈ lowered
- Efficient Dark Matter Dark Radiation scattering
- → Late kinetic decoupling
- $\rightsquigarrow\,$ Structure formation suppressed at small scales
- \sim Missing satellite problem solved for $T_{\rm kd} \lesssim 1 \text{ keV} (M_{\rm cut} \simeq 10^{10} M_{\odot})$

Bringmann, Hasenkamp, JK, JCAP **07** (2014) Dasgupta, Kopp, PRL **112** (2014)

- Dark sector thermalized for $T > T_x^{dec}$ via Higgs portal
- SM particles becoming non-relativistic afterwards heat SM bath, not U(1)_X bath → T_X < T_ν (depending on number of d.o.f. g_{*})
- Entropy conservation

$$\Delta N_{\rm eff}(T) = \left(\frac{T_x}{T_\nu}\right)^4 = \left[\frac{g_*^\nu(T)}{g_*^x(T)}\frac{g_*^x(T_x^{\rm dec})}{g_*^\nu(T_x^{\rm dec})}\right]^{\frac{4}{3}}$$

• Smallest value (obtained for $T_x^{dec} \gg m_t$): $\Delta N_{eff}(T_{BBN}) \simeq 0.33$

Variations

- Lighter dark photon or dark Higgs \rightsquigarrow relativistic during BBN $\rightsquigarrow g_*^x(T_{\text{BBN}}) \uparrow \rightsquigarrow \Delta N_{\text{eff}} \downarrow$
- Additional light dark particles

 $\rightsquigarrow g_*^x(T_{\text{BBN}}) \uparrow \text{ and } g_*^x(T_x^{\text{dec}}) \uparrow \text{ but } \frac{g_*^x(T_x^{\text{dec}})}{g_*^x(T_{\text{BBN}})} \downarrow \rightsquigarrow \Delta N_{\text{eff}} \downarrow$ Ko, Tang, PLB **739** (2014)

- Non-trivial interplay between decrease of T_x and increase of number of DR species
- Related models (different particle spins, more sterile neutrinos, ...) Archidiacono et al., PRD 91 (2015) Chu, Dasgupta, PRL 113 (2014) Cherry, Friedland, Shoemaker, arXiv:1411.1071 Kouvaris, Shoemaker, Tuominen, PRD 91 (2015) Binder et al., JCAP 11 (2016) Tang, PLB 757 (2016)
- Classification of minimal possibilities
 Bringmann, Ihle, JK, Walia, PRD 94 (2016)

- Standard scenario: mixing between active and sterile neutrinos
 → oscillations → ΔN_{eff} ≃ 1 → ruled out by Planck and BBN
- U(1)_X interactions → effective matter potential suppresses mixing
 → no production by oscillations for T ≥ MeV

Hannestad, Hansen, Tram, PRL **112** (2014) Dasgupta, Kopp, PRL **112** (2014)

- Standard scenario: mixing between active and sterile neutrinos
 → oscillations → ΔN_{eff} ≃ 1 → ruled out by Planck and BBN
- U(1)_X interactions → effective matter potential suppresses mixing
 → no production by oscillations for T ≥ MeV

Hannestad, Hansen, Tram, PRL **112** (2014) Dasgupta, Kopp, PRL **112** (2014)

- T < MeV: mixing unsuppressed
 - \rightarrow sterile neutrinos from oscillations + $U(1)_X$ -mediated scatterings

Bringmann, Hasenkamp, JK, JCAP 07 (2014) Mirizzi et al., PRD 91 (2015) Tang, PLB 750 (2015) Chu, Dasgupta, Kopp, JCAP 10 (2015) Cherry, Friedland, Shoemaker, arXiv:1605.06506 Forastieri et al., JCAP 07 (2017) Chu et al., JCAP 11 (2018)

- Standard scenario: mixing between active and sterile neutrinos \rightarrow oscillations $\rightarrow \Delta N_{eff} \simeq 1 \rightarrow$ ruled out by Planck and BBN
- $U(1)_X$ interactions \rightarrow effective matter potential suppresses mixing \rightarrow no production by oscillations for $T \ge MeV$

Hannestad, Hansen, Tram, PRL 112 (2014) Dasgupta, Kopp, PRL 112 (2014)

- T < MeV: mixing unsuppressed
 - \rightarrow sterile neutrinos from oscillations + $U(1)_X$ -mediated scatterings
 - $\rightarrow \sum m_{\nu}$ bound violated or too little free-streaming
 - \rightarrow Ruled out for $m_N \sim eV$ and $\mathcal{O}(0.1)$ mixing

```
Chu et al., JCAP 11 (2018)
```

- Standard scenario: mixing between active and sterile neutrinos
 → oscillations → ΔN_{eff} ≃ 1 → ruled out by Planck and BBN
- U(1)_X interactions → effective matter potential suppresses mixing
 → no production by oscillations for T ≥ MeV

Hannestad, Hansen, Tram, PRL **112** (2014) Dasgupta, Kopp, PRL **112** (2014)

- *T* < MeV: mixing unsuppressed
 - \rightsquigarrow sterile neutrinos from oscillations + $U(1)_X$ -mediated scatterings
 - $\rightarrow \sum m_{\nu}$ bound violated or too little free-streaming
 - \rightsquigarrow Ruled out for $m_N \sim eV$ and $\mathcal{O}(0.1)$ mixing
 - → ΔN_{eff}(T_{CMB}) < 0 possible for non-relativistic sterile neutrino Mirizzi et al., PRD 91 (2015) Tang, PLB 750 (2015) Chu, Dasgupta, Kopp, JCAP 10 (2015)

Suppressing σ_8 by Late Kinetic Decoupling

- DM Dark Radiation scattering via massless exchange particle
 - \rightsquigarrow Cross section $\propto T_x^{-2}$
 - → Increases as Universe expands
 - \rightsquigarrow suppression in the matter power spectrum: $\sigma_8 \downarrow$
- $\Delta N_{\rm eff}$ alleviates Hubble tension

Suppressing σ_8 by Late Kinetic Decoupling

- DM Dark Radiation scattering via massless exchange particle
 - \rightsquigarrow Cross section $\propto T_x^{-2}$
 - → Increases as Universe expands
 - \rightsquigarrow suppression in the matter power spectrum: $\sigma_8 \downarrow$
- $\Delta N_{\rm eff}$ alleviates Hubble tension
- Dark Radiation could be same as exchange particle (dark gluon) Buen-Abad et al., PRD 92 (2015) Lesgourgues et al., JCAP 02 (2016) Ko & Tang, PLB 768 (2017)

• ... or different (massless dark fermion) Ko & Tang, PLB **762** (2016) Ko et al., PLB **773** (2017)

- Vector DM and Dark Radiation could stem from same multiplet of dark SU(N) → SU(N − 1) Ko & Tang, PLB 768 (2017)
- Potential problems: too large DM self-interactions? ΔN_{eff} too large for BBN?

- Long-lived particle X, lifetime τ
- Decay after BBN, before recombination → only CMB affected, strong BBN bound avoided
- Decay products (daughters) form DR while relativistic
- $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = \Delta N_{\text{eff}}(\Omega_X, m_2/m_X, \tau)$ (m_2 : mass of heavier daughter)
- Single decay mode: heavier daughter is hot DM (or ΔN_{eff} ≪ 1)
 → can only be small fraction of DM
- Two decay modes: produce DR and DM with adjustable free-streaming length → address missing satellites, H₀, S₈
- Examples
 - $\bullet~$ Saxion \rightarrow axion + axion, axino + axino
 - $\bullet \ \ \text{Modulus} \rightarrow \text{gravitino} + \text{gravitino}, \text{axion} + \text{axion} \\$

Hasenkamp & JK, JCAP 08 (2013)

- DM → WDM + DR → velocity-kick for massive daughter → σ₈ ↓ Abellán et al., 2008.09615
- CMB, LSS → strong constraints → H₀ tension cannot be resolved Anchordoqui et al., 2203.04818
- S₈ tension can be alleviated Simon et al., 2203.07440
- *H*₀ and *S*₈ tensions cannot be resolved Davari & Khosravi, 2203.09439

- Dark Radiation (= BSM relativistic species) influences expansion history of the Universe
- Energy density parametrized by $\Delta N_{\rm eff}$
- Big Bang Nucleosynthesis $\rightsquigarrow \Delta N_{eff} < 0.124 @ 95\%$ C.L.
- Cosmic Microwave Background $\rightsquigarrow \Delta N_{eff} < 0.29 @ 95\%$ C.L.
- Constraints on specific scenarios
 - BBN constraints on MeV-scale particles decaying into DR Hufnagel et al., 1712.03972
 - BBN, CMB → lower bound on DM mass in thermal dark sector Sabti et al., 1910.01649, 2107.11232
- Short review on sterile neutrinos and Dark Radiation Archidiacono & Gariazzo, 2201.10319

- Biggest issues: Hubble and S₈ tensions
- Dark sectors have become quite popular
- Connections to neutrino physics (steriles, seesaw, secret interactions)
- HDM hints still valid?
- BBN precision has improved a lot
 → still room for interesting effects of Dark Radiation?
- CMB precision will improve further
- Non-trivial impact of models on CMB and structure formation
 ~> room for discoveries?
- Can any DR models lead to gravitational wave production?