Signals from the dark Universe: the DAMA/LIBRA results and perspectives

CP[3] Origins – Odense
February 11, 2013

P. Belli
INFN-Roma Tor Vergata

“Concordance model”







$\Omega = \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_M =$ close to 1

Ω = density/critical density

6 atoms of H/m^3

$$\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.74$$
$$\Omega_M \approx 0.26$$

The Universe is flat

Primordial Nucleosynthesis

Observations on:
- light nuclei abundance
- microlensings
- visible light.

Structure formation in the Universe

The baryons give “too small” contribution

$\Omega_b \sim 4\%$

Non baryonic **Cold Dark Matter** is dominant

$\Omega_{CDM} \sim 22\%,$
$\Omega_{HDM,\nu} < 1\ \%$

~ 90% of the matter in the Universe is non baryonic

A large part of the Universe is in form of non baryonic Cold Dark Matter particles

Relic DM particles from primordial Universe

SUSY
(as neutralino or sneutrino
In various scenarios)

the sneutrino in the Smith
and Weiner scenario

sterile ν

electron interacting dark matter

a heavy ν of the 4-th family

even a suitable particle not
yet foreseen by theories

axion-like (light pseudoscalar
and scalar candidate)

self-interacting dark matter

mirror dark matter

Kaluza-Klein particles (LKK)

heavy exotic canditates, as
“4th family atoms”, ...

Elementary Black holes,
Planckian objects,
Daemons

etc…

(& invisible axions, ν’s)

&

Right halo model and parameters?

- Composition?
  DM multicomponent also
  in the particle part?
- Right related nuclear and
  particle physics?

Non thermalized components?

Caustics?

clumpiness?

etc… etc…

What accelerators can do:

to demostrate the existence of some of the possible DM candidates

What accelerators cannot do:

to credit that a certain particle is the Dark Matter solution or the “single” Dark Matter particle solution…

+ DM candidates and scenarios exist (even for neutralino candidate) on which accelerators cannot give any information



DM direct detection method using a model independent approach and a low-background widely-sensitive target material

Some direct detection processes:

- Scatterings on nuclei

  → detection of nuclear recoil energy



- Inelastic Dark Matter: **W + N → W* + N**

  → W has Two mass states χ+ , χ- with δ mass splitting

  → Kinematical constraint for the inelastic scattering of χ- on a nucleus

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu v^2 \geq \delta \Leftrightarrow v \geq v_{thr} = \sqrt{\frac{2\delta}{\mu}}$$

- Excitation of bound electrons in scatterings on nuclei

  → detection of recoil nuclei + e.m. radiation

- Conversion of particle into e.m. radiation

  → detection of γ, X-rays, e^-



- Interaction only on atomic electrons

  → detection of e.m. radiation



… even WIMPs

- Interaction of light DMp (LDM) on e^- or nucleus with production of a lighter particle

  → detection of electron/nucleus recoil energy



e.g. sterile ν

e.g. signals from these candidates are completely lost in experiments based on "rejection procedures" of the e.m. component of their rate

… also other ideas …

- **… and more**

The direct detection experiments can be classified in two classes, depending on what they are based:

1. on the recognition of the signals due to Dark Matter particles with respect to the background by using a "model-independent" signature

2. on the use of uncertain techniques of rejection of electromagnetic background (adding systematical effects and lost of candidates with pure electromagnetic productions)





The annual modulation: a model independent signature for the investigation of Dark Matter particles component in the galactic halo

With the present technology, the annual modulation is the main model independent signature for the DM signal. Although the modulation effect is expected to be relatively small a suitable large-mass, low-radioactive set-up with an efficient control of the running conditions can point out its presence.

Drukier, Freese, Spergel PRD86
Freese et al. PRD88



- v_{sun} ~ 232 km/s (Sun velocity in the halo)
- v_{orb} = 30 km/s (Earth velocity around the Sun)
- $\gamma = \pi/3$, $\omega = 2\pi/T$, T = 1 year
- t_0 = 2nd June (when $v_\oplus$ is maximum)

$$v_\oplus(t) = v_{sun} + v_{orb} \cos\gamma\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$$

$$S_k[\eta(t)] = \int_{\Delta E_k} \frac{dR}{dE_R} dE_R \cong S_{0,k} + S_{m,k} \cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$$

Expected rate in given energy bin changes because the revolution motion of the Earth around the Sun, which is moving in the Galaxy

Requirements of the annual modulation

1) Modulated rate according cosine
2) In a definite low energy range
3) With a proper period (1 year)
4) With proper phase (about 2 June)
5) Just for single hit events in a multi-detector set-up
6) With modulation amplitude in the region of maximal sensitivity must be <7% for usually adopted halo distributions, but it can be larger in case of some possible scenarios

To mimic this signature, spurious effects and side reactions must not only - obviously - be able to account for the whole observed modulation amplitude, but also to satisfy contemporaneously all the requirements

The DM annual modulation signature has a different origin and peculiarities (e.g. the phase) than those effects correlated with the seasons

Roma2,Roma1,LNGS,IHEP/Beijing

+ by-products and small scale expts.: INR-Kiev
+ neutron meas.: ENEA-Frascati
+ in some studies on ββ decays (DST-MAE project): IIT Kharagpur, India

DAMA: an observatory for rare processes @LNGS



http://people.roma2.infn.it/dama

Several results on rare processes with low background scintillators

DAMA/LXe (NIMA482(2002)728)



- Dark Matter investigations: by PSD (PLB436(1998)379); inelastic scattering (PLB387(1996)222, NJP2(2000)15.1); neutron calibrations (PLB436(1998)379, EPJdirectC11(2001)1)
- 2β decay in ^{134}Xe, ^{136}Xe (PLB527(2002)182, PLB546(2002)23)
- CNC processes: e^- decay into invisible channels (A.P.5(1996)217); $e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\gamma$ (PRD61(2000)117301); nuclear level excitations(PLB465 (1999) 315); $^{136}Xe \rightarrow {}^{136}Cs$ (Beyond the Desert (2003) 365)
- N, NN, NNN decay (PLB493(2000)12, EPJA27 s01 (2006)35)

DAMA/Ge & LNGS Ge facility

- RDs on low background scint. and PMTs
- 2β decay in ^{100}Mo (NPA846(2010)143), ^{96}Ru and ^{104}Ru (EPJA42(2009)171), ^{136}Ce and ^{138}Ce (NPA824 (2009)101), ^{190}Pt and ^{198}Pt (EPJA47(2011)91), ^{156}Dy and ^{158}Dy (NPA859(2011)126)
- Search for ^{7}Li solar axions (NPA806(2008)388, PLB711(2012)41)
- First observation of α decay of ^{190}Pt to the first excited level of ^{186}Os (PRC83(2011)034603)
- Qualification and meas. of many materials: e.g. $CdWO_4$, $ZnWO_4$(NIMA626-7(2011)31, NIMA615 (2010)301), $Li_6Eu(BO_3)_3$ (NIMA572(2007)734), Li_2MoO_4 (NIMA607(2009) 573), $SrI_2(Eu)$ (NIMA670 (2012)10), $^{7}LiI(Eu)$ (NIMA704(2013)40)

DAMA/R&D

- Dark Matter with $CaF_2(Eu)$ (NPB563(1999)97, AP7(1997)73)
- 2β decay in ^{136}Ce, ^{138}Ce, ^{142}Ce, ^{40}Ca, ^{46}Ca, ^{48}Ca, ^{106}Cd, ^{108}Cd, ^{114}Cd, ^{116}Cd, ^{130}Ba, ^{64}Zn, ^{70}Zn, ^{180}W, ^{186}W with various low background scintillators (N.Cim.A110(1997)189, AP7(1997)73, NPB563(1999)97, AP10(1999)115, NPA705(2002)29, NIMA498(2003)352, NIMA525 (2004)535, PLB658(2008)193, NPA826(2009)256, JPG:NPP38(2011) 115107, EPJA36(2008)167, JPG: NPP38(2011)015103, PRC85(2012) 044610, JINST6(2011)P08011)

- α decay in ^{142}Ce, in ^{nat}Eu (NPA789(2007)15), β decay in ^{48}Ca, in ^{113}Cd (PRC76(2007)064603)
- Cluster decay in $LaCl_3(Ce)$ (NIMA555(2005)270)
- CNC decay $^{139}La \rightarrow {}^{139}Ce$ (UJP51(2006)1037)

- ^{106}Cd, ^{116}Cd in progress (PRC85(2012)044610, JINST6(2011)P08011)
- ADAMO project: Study of the DM directionality approach with $ZnWO_4$ anisotropic detectors (EPJC73(2013)2276)
- Many other meas. planned
- All the set-ups are continuously running

The pioneer DAMA/NaI: ≈100 kg highly radiopure NaI(Tl)



Performances: N.Cim.A112(1999)545-575, EPJC18(2000)283, Riv.N.Cim.26 n. 1(2003)1-73, IJMPD13(2004)2127

Results on rare processes:

- Possible Pauli exclusion principle violation — PLB408(1997)439
- CNC processes — PRC60(1999)065501
- Electron stability and non-paulian transitions in Iodine atoms (by L-shell) — PLB460(1999)235
- Search for solar axions — PLB515(2001)6
- Exotic Matter search — EPJdirect C14(2002)1
- Search for superdense nuclear matter — EPJA23(2005)7
- Search for heavy clusters decays — EPJA24(2005)51

Results on DM particles:

- PSD — PLB389(1996)757
- Investigation on diurnal effect — N.Cim.A112(1999)1541
- Exotic Dark Matter search — PRL83(1999)4918
- Annual Modulation Signature

PLB424(1998)195, PLB450(1999)448, PRD61(1999)023512, PLB480(2000)23, EPJC18(2000)283, PLB509(2001)197, EPJC23(2002)61, PRD66(2002)043503, Riv.N.Cim.26 n.1 (2003)1, IJMPD13(2004) 2127, IJMPA21(2006)1445, EPJC47(2006)263, IJMPA22(2007)3155, EPJC53(2008)205, PRD77(2008) 023506, MPLA23(2008)2125.

model independent evidence of a particle DM component in the galactic halo at 6.3σ C.L.

total exposure (7 annual cycles) 0.29 ton×yr

The DAMA/LIBRA set-up ~250 kg NaI(Tl)
(Large sodium Iodide Bulk for RAre processes)

As a result of a second generation R&D for more radiopure NaI(Tl)
by exploiting new chemical/physical radiopurification techniques
(all operations involving crystals and PMTs - including photos - in HP Nitrogen atmosphere)

Residual contaminations in the new DAMA/LIBRA NaI(Tl) detectors:
^{232}Th, ^{238}U and ^{40}K at level of 10^{-12} g/g

- ***Radiopurity,performances, procedures, etc.:*** NIMA592(2008)297, JINST 7 (2012) 03009
- ***Results on DM particles:*** *Annual Modulation Signature:* EPJC56(2008)333, EPJC67(2010)39
- ***Results on rare processes:*** *PEP violation in Na, I:* EPJC62(2009)327, *CNC in I:* EPJC72(2012)1920

DAMA @ LNGS








…calibration procedures

The DAMA/LIBRA set-up

For details, radiopurity, performances, procedures, etc.
NIMA592(2008)297, JINST 7(2012)03009

Polyethylene/paraffin

- 25 x 9.7 kg NaI(Tl) in a 5x5 matrix
- two Suprasil-B light guides directly coupled to each bare crystal
- two PMTs working in coincidence at the single ph. el. threshold





5.5-7.5 phe/keV

~ 1m concrete from GS rock

- Dismounting/Installing protocol (with “Scuba” system)
- All the materials selected for low radioactivity
- Multicomponent passive shield (>10 cm of Cu, 15 cm of Pb + Cd foils, 10/40 cm Polyethylene/paraffin, about 1 m concrete, mostly outside the installation)
- Three-level system to exclude Radon from the detectors
- Calibrations in the same running conditions as production runs
- Installation in air conditioning + huge heat capacity of shield
- Monitoring/alarm system; many parameters acquired with the production data
- Pulse shape recorded by Waweform Analyzer Acqiris DC270 (2chs per detector), 1 *Gsample/s,* 8 bit, bandwidth 250 MHz
- Data collected from low energy up to MeV region, despite the hardware optimization was done for the low energy

Some on residual contaminants in new ULB NaI(Tl) detectors



α/e pulse shape discrimination has practically 100% effectiveness in the MeV range

The measured α yield in the new DAMA/LIBRA detectors ranges from 7 to some tens α/kg/day

Second generation R&D for new DAMA/LIBRA crystals: new selected powders, physical/ chemical radiopurification, new selection of overall materials, new protocol for growing and handling

^{232}Th residual contamination From time-amplitude method. If ^{232}Th chain at equilibrium: it ranges from 0.5 ppt to 7.5 ppt

^{238}U residual contamination First estimate: considering the measured α and ^{232}Th activity, if ^{238}U chain at equilibrium $\Rightarrow$ ^{238}U contents in new detectors typically range from 0.7 to 10 ppt



^{238}U chain splitted into 5 subchains: ^{238}U $\rightarrow$ ^{234}U $\rightarrow$ ^{230}Th $\rightarrow$ ^{226}Ra $\rightarrow$ ^{210}Pb $\rightarrow$ ^{206}Pb

Thus, in this case: (2.1±0.1) ppt of ^{232}Th; (0.35 ±0.06) ppt for ^{238}U

and: (15.8±1.6) μBq/kg for ^{234}U + ^{230}Th; (21.7±1.1) μBq/kg for ^{226}Ra; (24.2±1.6) μBq/kg for ^{210}Pb.

^{nat}K residual contamination

The analysis has given for the ^{nat}K content in the crystals values not exceeding about 20 ppb







^{129}I and ^{210}Pb

^{129}I/^{nat}I ≈1.7×10^{-13} for all the new detectors

^{210}Pb in the new detectors: (5 − 30) μBq/kg.

No sizable surface pollution by Radon daugthers, thanks to the new handling protocols

... more on NIMA592 (2008)297

Some on residual contaminants in NaI(Tl) detectors



α/e pulse shape discrimination has practically 100% effectiveness in the MeV range

The measured α yield in the new DAMA/LIBRA detectors ranges from 7 to some tens α/kg/day

Second generation R&D for new DAMA/LIBRA crystals: new selected powders, physical/chemical radiopurification, new selection of overall materials, new protocol for growing and handling

^{232}Th residual contamination

Time-amplitude method: arrival time and energy of each event used for selection of fast decay chains in ^{232}Th family

^{224}Ra (Q_α=5.8 MeV, $T_{1/2}$=3.66 d) → ^{220}Rn (Q_α=6.4 MeV, $T_{1/2}$=55.6 s) → ^{216}Po (Q_α=6.9 MeV, $T_{1/2}$=0.145 s) → ^{212}Pb

α peaks as well as the distributions of the time intervals between the events are in a good agreement with those expected

$$\alpha/\beta = 0.467(6) + 0.0257(10) \times E_\alpha [MeV]$$

Example: 3310 triple delayed coincidences in 8100 kg×day → (9.0±0.4) μBq/kg



⇒ ^{228}Th activity ranging from 2 to about 30 μBq/kg in the DAMA/LIBRA detectors (in agreement with Bi-Po analysis)

If ^{232}Th chain at equilibrium: ^{232}Th contents in new detectors typically range from 0.5 ppt to 7.5 ppt

DAMA/LIBRA calibrations

Low energy: various external gamma sources (^{241}Am, ^{133}Ba) and internal X-rays or gamma's (^{40}K, ^{125}I, ^{129}I), routine calibrations with ^{241}Am





$$\frac{\sigma_{LE}}{E} = \frac{(0.448 \pm 0.035)}{\sqrt{E(keV)}} + (9.1 \pm 5.1) \cdot 10^{-3}$$



The curves superimposed to the experimental data have been obtained by simulations

High energy: external sources of gamma rays (e.g. ^{137}Cs, ^{60}Co and ^{133}Ba) and gamma rays of 1461 keV due to ^{40}K decays in an adjacent detector, tagged by the 3.2 keV X-rays





The signals (unlike low energy events) for high energy events are taken only from one PMT



$$\frac{\sigma_{HE}}{E} = \frac{(1.12 \pm 0.06)}{\sqrt{E(keV)}} + (17 \pm 23) \cdot 10^{-4}$$

Thus, here and hereafter keV means keV electron equivalent

DAMA/LIBRA data taking

Period		Mass (kg)	Exposure (kg × day)	α-β^2
DAMA/LIBRA-1	Sep. 9, 2003 – July 21, 2004	232.8	51405	0.562
DAMA/LIBRA-2	July 21, 2004 – Oct. 28, 2005	232.8	52597	0.467
DAMA/LIBRA-3	Oct. 28, 2005 – July 18, 2006	232.8	39445	0.591
DAMA/LIBRA-4	July 19, 2006 – July 17, 2007	232.8	49377	0.541
DAMA/LIBRA-5	July 17, 2007 – Aug. 29, 2008	232.8	66105	0.468
DAMA/LIBRA-6	Nov. 12, 2008 – Sep. 1, 2009	242.5	58768	0.519
DAMA/LIBRA-1 to -6	**Sep. 9, 2003 – Sep. 1, 2009**		**317697 = 0.87 ton×yr**	**0.519**

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)

total exposure: 425428 kg×day = 1.17 ton×yr

- **calibrations: ≈72 M events from sources**
- **acceptance window eff: 82 M events (≈3M events/keV)**

- **EPJC56(2008)333**
- **EPJC67(2010)39**

- **First upgrade on Sept 2008:**
  - replacement of some PMTs in HP N_2 atmosphere
  - restore 1 detector to operation
  - new Digitizers installed (U1063A Acqiris 1GS/s 8-bit High-Speed cPCI)
  - new DAQ system with optical read-out installed

The annual cycle 2009/10 will be released soon – End of the DAMA/LIBRA – phase 1

START of DAMA/LIBRA – phase 2

- **Second upgrade on Oct./Nov. 2010**
  - replacement of all the PMTs with higher Q.E. ones

Two annual cycles at lower energy threshold at hand…

… continuously running

Model Independent Annual Modulation Result

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)   Total exposure: 425428 kg×day = 1.17 ton×yr

experimental single-hit residuals rate vs time and energy



$A\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$; continuous lines: t_0 = 152.5 d, T = 1.00 y

2-4 keV

A=(0.0183±0.0022) cpd/kg/keV

χ^2/dof = 75.7/79   **8.3 σ C.L.**

Absence of modulation? No

χ^2/dof=147/80 ⇒ P(A=0) = 7×10^{-6}

2-5 keV

A=(0.0144±0.0016) cpd/kg/keV

χ^2/dof = 56.6/79   **9.0 σ C.L.**

Absence of modulation? No

χ^2/dof=135/80 ⇒ P(A=0) = 1.1×10^{-4}

2-6 keV

A=(0.0114±0.0013) cpd/kg/keV

χ^2/dof = 64.7/79 **8.8 σ C.L.**

Absence of modulation? No

χ^2/dof=140/80 ⇒ P(A=0) = 4.3×10^{-5}

The data favor the presence of a modulated behavior with proper features at 8.8σ C.L.

Model Independent Annual Modulation Result

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)   Total exposure: 425428 kg×day = 1.17 ton×yr

experimental single-hit residuals rate vs time and energy

2-4 keV

$A\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]$; continuous lines: t_0 = 152.5 d, T = 1.00 y





2-6 keV

A=(0.0114±0.0013) cpd/kg/keV

χ^2/dof = 64.7/79 **8.8 σ C.L.**

Absence of modulation? No

χ^2/dof=140/80 ⇒ P(A=0) = 4.3×10^{-5}

The data favor the presence of a modulated behavior with proper features at 8.8σ C.L.

Modulation amplitudes (A), period (T) and phase (t_0) measured in DAMA/NaI and DAMA/LIBRA

DAMA/NaI (7 annual cycles: 0.29 ton x yr) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 annual cycles: 0.87 ton x yr)

total exposure: 425428 kg×day = 1.17 ton×yr

A, T, t_0 obtained by fitting the single-hit data with $\mathbf{A\cos[\omega(t-t_0)]}$

	A (cpd/kg/keV)	T= 2π/ω (yr)	t_0 (day)	C.L.
DAMA/NaI + DAMA/LIBRA				
(2÷4) keV	0.0194 ± 0.0022	0.996 ± 0.002	136 ± 7	8.8σ
(2÷5) keV	0.0149 ± 0.0016	0.997 ± 0.002	142 ± 7	9.3σ
(2÷6) keV	0.0116 ± 0.0013	0.999 ± 0.002	146 ± 7	8.9σ

The χ^2 test (χ^2 = 9.3, 12.2 and 10.1 over 12 *d.o.f.* for the three energy intervals, respectively) and the *run test* (lower tail probabilities of 57%, 47% and 35% for the three energy intervals, respectively) accept at 90% C.L. the hypothesis that the modulation amplitudes are normally fluctuating around their best fit values.



Compatibility among the annual cycles

Power spectrum of single-hit residuals



2-6 keV vs 6-14 keV

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)
total exposure: 1.17 ton×yr

Principal mode in the 2-6 keV region:
$2.735 \times 10^{-3}\ d^{-1} \approx 1\ yr^{-1}$

Not present in the 6-14 keV region (only aliasing peaks)

The Lomb-Scargle periodogram, as reported in DAMA papers, always according to Ap.J. 263 (1982) 835, Ap.J. 338 (1989) 277; with the treatment of the experimental errors and of the time binning:

Given a set of data values r_i, $i = 1, \ldots N$ at respective observation times t_i, the Lomb-Scargle periodogram is:

$$P_N(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left\{\frac{\left[\sum_i (r_i - \bar{r})\cos\omega(t_i - \tau)\right]^2}{\sum_i \cos^2\omega(t_i - \tau)} + \frac{\left[\sum_i (r_i - \bar{r})\sin\omega(t_i - \tau)\right]^2}{\sum_i \sin^2\omega(t_i - \tau)}\right\}$$

where: $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_1^N r_i \qquad \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_1^N (r_i - \bar{r})^2$

and, for each angular frequency $\omega = 2\pi f > 0$ of interest, the time-offset τ is:

$$\tan(2\omega\tau) = \frac{\sum_i \sin(2\omega t_i)}{\sum_i \cos(2\omega t_i)}$$

In order to take into account the different time binning and the residuals' errors we have to rewrite the previous formulae replacing:

$$\sum_i \rightarrow \sum_i \frac{\frac{N}{\Delta r_i^2}}{\sum_j \frac{1}{\Delta r_j^2}} = \frac{N}{\sum_j \frac{1}{\Delta r_j^2}} \cdot \sum_i \frac{1}{\Delta r_i^2}$$

$$\sin\omega t_i \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\Delta t_i}\int_{t_i - \Delta t_i}^{t_i + \Delta t_i} \sin\omega t\, dt$$

$$\cos\omega t_i \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\Delta t_i}\int_{t_i - \Delta t_i}^{t_i + \Delta t_i} \cos\omega t\, dt$$

The Nyquist frequency is ≈3 y^{-1} (≈0.008 d^{-1}); meaningless higher frequencies, washed off by the integration over the time binning.

Clear annual modulation is evident in (2-6) keV, while it is absent just above 6 keV

Rate behaviour above 6 keV

- **No Modulation above 6 keV**



Mod. Ampl. (6-10 keV): cpd/kg/keV
(0.0016 ± 0.0031) DAMA/LIBRA-1
-(0.0010 ± 0.0034) DAMA/LIBRA-2
-(0.0001 ± 0.0031) DAMA/LIBRA-3
-(0.0006 ± 0.0029) DAMA/LIBRA-4
-(0.0021 ± 0.0026) DAMA/LIBRA-5
(0.0029 ± 0.0025) DAMA/LIBRA-6
→ statistically consistent with zero

DAMALIBRA-1 to -6



σ ≈ 1%, fully accounted by statistical considerations

- **No modulation in the whole energy spectrum:** studying integral rate at higher energy, R_{90}
  - R_{90} percentage variations with respect to their mean values for single crystal in the DAMA/LIBRA running periods
  - Fitting the behaviour with time, adding a term modulated with period and phase as expected for DM particles:

Period	Mod. Ampl.
DAMA/LIBRA-1	-(0.05±0.19) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-2	-(0.12±0.19) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-3	-(0.13±0.18) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-4	(0.15±0.17) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-5	(0.20±0.18) cpd/kg
DAMA/LIBRA-6	-(0.20±0.16) cpd/kg

consistent with zero

+ if a modulation present in the whole energy spectrum at the level found in the lowest energy region → R_{90} ~ tens cpd/kg → ~ 100 σ far away

No modulation above 6 keV
This accounts for all sources of bckg and is consistent with studies on the various components

Multiple-hits events in the region of the signal

- Each detector has its own TDs read-out → pulse profiles of *multiple-hits* events (multiplicity > 1) acquired (exposure: 0.87 ton×yr).

- The same hardware and software procedures as those followed for *single-hit* events

signals by Dark Matter particles do not belong to *multiple-hits* events, that is:

multiple-hits events	=	Dark Matter particles events "switched off"



Evidence of annual modulation with proper features as required by the DM annual modulation signature:
- present in the ***single-hit*** residuals
- absent in the ***multiple-hits*** residual

This result offers an additional strong support for the presence of Dark Matter particles in the galactic halo, further excluding any side effect either from hardware or from software procedures or from background

Energy distribution of the modulation amplitudes

$$R(t) = S_0 + S_m \cos\left[\omega\left(t - t_0\right)\right]$$

here $T=2\pi/\omega=1$ yr and $t_0= 152.5$ day

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)

total exposure: 425428 kg×day ≈1.17 ton×yr



A clear modulation is present in the (2-6) keV energy interval, while S_m values compatible with zero are present just above

The S_m values in the (6–20) keV energy interval have random fluctuations around zero with χ^2 equal to 27.5 for 28 degrees of freedom

Statistical distributions of the modulation amplitudes (S_m)

a) S_m for each detector, each annual cycle and each considered energy bin (here 0.25 keV)
b) $<S_m>$ = mean values over the detectors and the annual cycles for each energy bin; σ = error on S_m

DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)
total exposure: 0.87 ton×yr

Each panel refers to each detector separately; 96 entries = 16 energy bins in 2-6 keV energy interval × 6 DAMA/LIBRA annual cycles (for crys 16, 1 annual cycle, 16 entries)



2-6 keV

Standard deviations of
$(S_m-\langle S_m\rangle)/\sigma$
for each detectors



$x=(S_m-<S_m>)/\sigma$,

$\chi^2=\Sigma x^2$

Individual S_m values follow a normal distribution since **$(S_m-<S_m>)/\sigma$** is distributed as a Gaussian with a unitary standard deviation (r.m.s.)

⟹ **S_m** statistically well distributed in all the detectors and annual cycles

Statistical analyses about modulation amplitudes (S_m)

$x=(S_m-\langle S_m\rangle)/\sigma$,

$\chi^2=\Sigma\, x^2$

$\chi^2/d.o.f.$ values of S_m distributions for each DAMA/LIBRA detector in the (2–6) keV energy interval for the six annual cycles.

DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)

total exposure: 0.87 ton×yr



The $\chi^2/d.o.f.$ values range from 0.7 to 1.22 (96 $d.o.f.$ = 16 energy bins × 6 annual cycles) for 24 detectors $\Rightarrow$ at 95% C.L. the observed annual modulation effect is well distributed in all these detectors.

The remaining detector has $\chi^2/d.o.f.$ = 1.28 exceeding the value corresponding to that C.L.; this also is statistically consistent, considering that the expected number of detectors exceeding this value over 25 is 1.25.

- The mean value of the twenty-five points is 1.066, slightly larger than 1. Although this can be still ascribed to statistical fluctuations, let us ascribe it to a possible systematics.
- In this case, one would have an additional error of $\leq 4 \times 10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV, if quadratically combined, or $\leq 5\times10^{-5}$ cpd/kg/keV, if linearly combined, to the modulation amplitude measured in the (2 – 6) keV energy interval.
- This possible additional error (**≤ 4 %** or **≤ 0.5%**, respectively, of the DAMA/LIBRA modulation amplitude) can be considered as an upper limit of possible systematic effects

Energy distributions of cosine (S_m) and sine (Z_m) modulation amplitudes

$$R(t) = S_0 + S_m \cos[\omega(t - t_0)] + Z_m \sin[\omega(t - t_0)]$$

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)

total exposure: 425428 kg×day = 1.17 ton×yr



t_0 = *152.5 day* (2° June)

***maximum at* 2° June**

as for DM particles



***maximum at* 1° September**

***T/4* days after 2° June**

The χ^2 test in the (2-14) keV and (2-20) keV energy regions (χ^2/dof = 21.6/24 and 47.1/36, probabilities of 60% and 10%, respectively) supports the hypothesis that the $Z_{m,k}$ values are simply fluctuating around zero.

Is there a sinusoidal contribution in the signal? Phase ≠ 152.5 day?

DAMA/NaI (7 years) + DAMA/LIBRA (6 years)

total exposure: 425428 kg×day = 1.17 ton×yr

$$R(t) = S_0 + S_m \cos[\omega(t - t_0)] + Z_m \sin[\omega(t - t_0)] = S_0 + Y_m \cos[\omega(t - t^*)]$$

For Dark Matter signals:

- $|Z_m| \ll |S_m| \approx |Y_m|$
- $\omega = 2\pi/T$
- $t^* \approx t_0 = 152.5d$
- $T = 1$ year

Slight differences from 2nd June are expected in case of contributions from non thermalized DM components (as e.g. the SagDEG stream)





E (keV)	S_m (cpd/kg/keV)	Z_m (cpd/kg/keV)	Y_m (cpd/kg/keV)	t* (day)
2-6	0.0111 ± 0.0013	-0.0004 ± 0.0014	0.0111 ± 0.0013	150.5 ± 7.0
6-14	-0.0001 ± 0.0008	0.0002 ± 0.0005	-0.0001 ± 0.0008	--

The analysis at energies above 6 keV, the analysis of the multiple-hits events and the statistical considerations about S_m already exclude any sizable presence of systematical effects

Additional investigations on the stability parameters

Modulation amplitudes obtained by fitting the time behaviours of main running parameters, acquired with the production data, when including a DM-like modulation

Running conditions stable at a level better than 1% also in the two new running periods

	DAMA/LIBRA-1	DAMA/LIBRA-2	DAMA/LIBRA-3	DAMA/LIBRA-4	DAMA/LIBRA-5	DAMA/LIBRA-6
Temperature	-(0.0001 ± 0.0061) °C	(0.0026 ± 0.0086) °C	(0.001 ± 0.015) °C	(0.0004 ± 0.0047) °C	(0.0001 ± 0.0036) °C	(0.0007 ± 0.0059) °C
Flux N_2	(0.13 ± 0.22) l/h	(0.10 ± 0.25) l/h	-(0.07 ± 0.18) l/h	-(0.05 ± 0.24) l/h	-(0.01 ± 0.21) l/h	-(0.01 ± 0.15) l/h
Pressure	(0.015 ± 0.030) mbar	-(0.013 ± 0.025) mbar	(0.022 ± 0.027) mbar	(0.0018 ± 0.0074) mbar	-(0.08 ± 0.12) $\times 10^{-2}$ mbar	(0.07 ± 0.13) $\times 10^{-2}$ mbar
Radon	-(0.029 ± 0.029) Bq/m^3	-(0.030 ± 0.027) Bq/m^3	(0.015 ± 0.029) Bq/m^3	-(0.052 ± 0.039) Bq/m^3	(0.021 ± 0.037) Bq/m^3	-(0.028 ± 0.036) Bq/m^3
Hardware rate above single photoelectron	-(0.20 ± 0.18) $\times 10^{-2}$ Hz	(0.09 ± 0.17) $\times 10^{-2}$ Hz	-(0.03 ± 0.20) $\times 10^{-2}$ Hz	(0.15 ± 0.15) $\times 10^{-2}$ Hz	(0.03 ± 0.14) $\times 10^{-2}$ Hz	(0.08 ± 0.11) $\times 10^{-2}$ Hz

All the measured amplitudes well compatible with zero

+ none can account for the observed effect

(to mimic such signature, spurious effects and side reactions must not only be able to account for the whole observed modulation amplitude, but also simultaneously satisfy all the 6 requirements)

No role for ^{40}K in the experimental S_m

also see arXiv:0912.0660



The experimental S_m cannot be due to ^{40}K for many reasons.

No modulation of the double coincidence events (1461 keV-3 keV).







The ^{40}K double coincidence events are not modulated

Any modulation contribution around 3 keV in the single-hit events from the hypothetical cases of: i) ^{40}K "exotic" modulated decay; ii) spill-out effects from double to single events and viceversa, is ruled out at more than 10 σ

Can a possible thermal neutron modulation account for the observed effect?

NO

• **Thermal neutrons flux measured at LNGS :**

$$\Phi_n = 1.08\ 10^{-6}\ n\ cm^{-2}\ s^{-1}$$ **(N.Cim.A101(1989)959)**



- Experimental upper limit on the thermal neutrons flux "*surviving*" the neutron shield in DAMA/LIBRA:
  - studying triple coincidences able to give evidence for the possible presence of ^{24}Na from neutron activation:

$$\Phi_n < 1.2 \times 10^{-7}\ n\ cm^{-2}\ s^{-1}\ (90\%C.L.)$$

- Two consistent upper limits on thermal neutron flux have been obtained with DAMA/NaI considering the same capture reactions and using different approaches.

Evaluation of the expected effect:

- Capture rate = $\Phi_n\ \sigma_n\ N_T$ < 0.022 captures/day/kg

HYPOTHESIS: assuming very cautiously a 10% thermal neutron modulation:

$$S_m^{(thermal\ n)} < 0.8 \times 10^{-6}\ cpd/kg/keV\ (< 0.01\%\ S_m^{observed})$$

MC simulation of the process

When $\Phi_n = 10^{-6}\ n\ cm^{-2}\ s^{-1}$:

$7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ cpd/kg/keV

$1.4 \cdot 10^{-3}$ cpd/kg/keV



E (MeV)

In all the cases of neutron captures (^{24}Na, ^{128}I, ...) a possible thermal n modulation induces a variation in all the energy spectrum

Already excluded also by R_{90} analysis

Can a possible fast neutron modulation account for the observed effect?

NO

In the estimate of the possible effect of the neutron background cautiously not included the 1m concrete moderator, which almost completely surrounds (mostly outside the barrack) the passive shield

Measured fast neutron flux @ LNGS:
$\Phi_n = 0.9\ 10^{-7}$ n cm^{-2} s^{-1} (Astropart.Phys.4 (1995)23)

By MC: differential counting rate above 2 keV ≈ 10^{-3} cpd/kg/keV

HYPOTHESIS: assuming - very cautiously - a 10% neutron modulation: ⇒ $S_m^{(\text{fast n})} < 10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV (< 0.5% S_m^{observed})

- Experimental upper limit on the fast neutrons flux "*surviving*" the neutron shield in DAMA/LIBRA:
  - through the study of the inelastic reaction ^{23}Na(n,n′)^{23}Na*(2076 keV) which produces two γ's in coincidence (1636 keV and 440 keV):

    $$\Phi_n < 2.2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ n cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ (90\%C.L.)}$$

  - well compatible with the measured values at LNGS. This further excludes any presence of a fast neutron flux in DAMA/LIBRA significantly larger than the measured ones.

Moreover, a possible fast n modulation would induce:

- a variation in all the energy spectrum (steady environmental fast neutrons always accompained by thermalized component)

  already excluded also by R_{90}
- a modulation amplitude for multiple-hit events different from zero

  already excluded by the multiple-hit events

Thus, a possible 5% neutron modulation (ICARUS TM03-01) cannot quantitatively contribute to the DAMA/NaI observed signal, even if the neutron flux would be assumed 100 times larger than measured by various authors over more than 15 years @ LNGS

The ^{128}I case

Can.J.Phys.89(2011)141, SIF Atti Conf. 103 (2011) 157, arXiv:1007.0595, EPJC72(2012)2064

Environmental neutrons (mainly thermal and epithermal) can be captured by Iodine (arXiv:1006.5255); can the produced ^{128}I be responsible of the observed modulation? → **The answer is no.**



Resonant neutron total cross sections of neutrons on Sodium and Iodine

^{128}I decay schema	Mode	Branching r. (%)	Q-value (keV)
	β^-	93.1	2119
	EC+β^+	6.9	1252

X-rays and Auger electrons produced in EC can release all the energy in the detectors (*single-hit*), corresponding to the atomic binding energy either of the K-shell (32 keV) or of the L-shells (4.3 to 5 keV) of the ^{128}Te

1) L-shells contribution ⇒ gaussian around 4.5 keV
2) Contribution (2-4) keV ≈ contribution (6-8) keV
3) K-shell contribution around 30 keV must be 8 times larger than that of L-shell
4) ^{128}I also decays by β^- with much larger branching ratio than EC and with β^- end-point energy at 2 MeV → ***no modulation observed at high energy***

→ ***excluded by the data***





Maximum expected counting rate from ^{128}I (90%CL)



^{128}I activity <15 μBq/kg (90%CL)

Even assuming a 10% modulation in the neutron flux (!?), the contribution to S_m is <3×10^{-4} cpd/kg/keV at low energy (that is <2% of the observed modulation amplitudes)



No role is played by ^{128}I

No role for μ in DAMA annual modulation result

✓ **Direct μ interaction in DAMA/LIBRA set-up:**

DAMA/LIBRA surface ≈0.13 m^2
μ flux @ DAMA/LIBRA ≈2.5 μ/day

MonteCarlo simulation:

- muon intensity distribution
- Gran Sasso rock overburden map
- Single hit events

It cannot mimic the signature: already excluded by R_{90}, by *multi-hits* analysis + different phase, etc.

EPJC72(2012)2064





Detector's matrix

✓ **Rate, R_n, of fast neutrons produced by μ:**

R_n = (fast n by μ)/(time unit) = $\Phi_\mu Y M_{eff}$

- Φ_μ @ LNGS ≈ 20 μ $m^{-2}d^{-1}$ (±1.5% modulated)
- Measured neutron Yield @ LNGS:

$Y=1\div7\ 10^{-4}$ n/μ/(g/cm^2)

Annual modulation amplitude at low energy due to μ **modulation**:

$$S_m^{(m)} = R_n\ g\ \varepsilon\ f_{DE}\ f_{single}\ 2\% / (M_{setup}\ \Delta E)$$

g = geometrical factor;
ε = detection eff. by elastic scattering
f_{DE} = energy window (E>2keV) effic.;
f_{single} = single hit effic.

Hyp.: M_{eff} = 15 tons; $g \approx \varepsilon \approx f_{\Delta E} \approx f_{single} \approx 0.5$ (cautiously)
Knowing that: $M_{setup} \approx$ 250 kg and ΔE=4keV

$$S_m^{(m)} < (0.3\text{-}2.4) \times 10^{-5}\ \text{cpd/kg/keV}$$

Moreover, this modulation also induces a variation in other parts of the energy spectrum and in the *multi-hits* events

It cannot mimic the signature: already excluded by R_{90}, by *multi-hits* analysis + different phase, etc.

Inconsistency of the phase between DAMA signal and μ modulation

For many others arguments EPJC72(2012)2064



μ flux @ LNGS (MACRO, LVD, BOREXINO) ≈$3\cdot10^{-4}$ $m^{-2}s^{-1}$; modulation amplitude 1.5%; phase: July 7 ± 6 d, June 29 ± 6 d (Borexino)

but

- the muon phase differs from year to year (error no purely statistical); LVD/BOREXINO value is a "mean" of the muon phase of each year
- The DAMA: modulation amplitude 10^{-2} cpd/kg/keV, in 2-6 keV energy range for single hit events; phase:
  May 26 ± 7 days (stable over 13 years)

The DAMA phase is 5.7σ far from the LVD/BOREXINO phases of muons (7.1 σ far from MACRO measured phase)

considering the seasonal weather al LNGS, quite impossible that the max. temperature of the outer atmosphere (on which μ flux variation is dependent) is observed e.g. in June 15 which is 3 σ from DAMA

Can (whatever) hypothetical cosmogenic products be considered as side effects, assuming that they might produce:

- only events at low energy,
- only *single-hit* events,
- no sizable effect in the *multiple-hit* counting rate
- pulses with time structure as scintillation light

But, its phase should be (much) larger than μ phase, t_μ :

- if $\tau \ll T/2\pi$: $t_{side} = t_\mu + \tau$
- if $\tau \gg T/2\pi$: $t_{side} = t_\mu + T/4$

It cannot mimic the signature: different phase

Summary of the results obtained in the additional investigations of possible systematics or side reactions

(e.g. NIMA592(2008)297, EPJC56(2008)333, arXiv:0912.0660, Can. J. Phys. 89 (2011) 11, S.I.F.Atti Conf.103(2011) (arXiv:1007.0595), PhysProc37(2012)1095, EPJC72(2012)2064)

DAMA/LIBRA 1-6

Source	Main comment	Cautious upper limit (90%C.L.)
RADON	Sealed Cu box in HP Nitrogen atmosphere, 3-level of sealing, etc.	$<2.5\times10^{-6}$ cpd/kg/keV
TEMPERATURE	Installation is air conditioned+ detectors in Cu housings directly in contact with multi-ton shield→ huge heat capacity + T continuously recorded	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
NOISE	Effective full noise rejection near threshold	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
ENERGY SCALE	Routine + instrinsic calibrations	$<1\text{-}2\times10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
EFFICIENCIES	Regularly measured by dedicated calibrations	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
BACKGROUND	No modulation above 6 keV; no modulation in the (2-6) keV *multiple-hits* events; this limit includes all possible sources of background	$<10^{-4}$ cpd/kg/keV
SIDE REACTIONS	Muon flux variation measured at LNGS	$<3\times10^{-5}$ cpd/kg/keV

+ they cannot satisfy all the requirements of annual modulation signature

Thus, they cannot mimic the observed annual modulation effect

Summarizing the model independent annual modulation result

- Presence of modulation for 13 annual cycles at 8.9σ C.L. with the proper distinctive features of the DM signature; all the features satisfied by the data over 13 independent experiments of 1 year each one

- The total exposure by former DAMA/NaI and present DAMA/LIBRA is 1.17 ton × yr (13 annual cycles)

- In fact, as required by the DM annual modulation signature:

1. The *single-hit* events show a clear cosine-like modulation, as expected for the DM signal

2. Measured period is equal to (0.999±0.002) yr, well compatible with the 1 yr period, as expected for the DM signal

3. Measured phase (146±7) days is well compatible with 152.5 days, as expected for the DM signal

4. The modulation is present only in the low energy (2-6) keV interval and not in other higher energy regions, consistently with expectation for the DM signal

5. The modulation is present only in the *single-hit* events, while it is absent in the *multiple-hits*, as expected for the DM signal

6. The measured modulation amplitude in NaI(Tl) of the *single-hit* events in (2-6) keV is: (0.0116 ± 0.0013) cpd/kg/keV (8.9σ C.L.).

No systematic or side process able to simultaneously satisfy all the many peculiarities of the signature and to account for the whole measured modulation amplitude is available

Model-independent evidence by DAMA/NaI and DAMA/LIBRA

well compatible with several candidates (in many possible astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics scenarios)

Neutralino as LSP in various SUSY theories

Various kinds of WIMP candidates with several different kind of interactions Pure SI, pure SD, mixed + Migdal effect +channeling,… (from low to high mass)

a heavy ν of the 4-th family

Pseudoscalar, scalar or mixed light bosons with axion-like interactions

WIMP with preferred inelastic scattering

Mirror Dark Matter

Light Dark Matter

Self interacting Dark Matter

Dark Matter (including some scenarios for WIMP) electron-interacting

Sterile neutrino

heavy exotic canditates, as "4th family atoms", ...



Elementary Black holes such as the Daemons

Kaluza Klein particles

… and more

Possible model dependent positive hints from indirect searches (but interpretation, evidence itself, derived mass and cross sections depend e.g. on bckg modeling, on DM spatial velocity distribution in the galactic halo, etc.) **not in conflict with DAMA results;**

Available results from direct searches using different target materials and approaches do not give any robust conflict & compatibility with positive excesses

Just few examples of interpretation of the annual modulation in terms of candidate particles in some scenarios

- Not best fit
- About the same C.L.

WIMP: SI





WIMP: SI & SD $\theta = 2.435$





LDM, bosonic DM





EPJC56(2008)333

Compatibility with several candidates; other ones are open



About interpretation

See e.g.: Riv.N.Cim.26 n.1(2003)1, IJMPD13(2004)2127, EPJC47(2006)263, IJMPA21(2006)1445, EPJC56(2008)333, PRD84(2011)055014

…models…

- Which particle?
- Which interaction coupling?
- Which Form Factors for each target-material?
- Which Spin Factor?
- Which nuclear model framework?
- Which scaling law?
- Which halo model, profile and related parameters?
- Streams?
- …

…and experimental aspects…

- Exposures
- Energy threshold
- Detector response (phe/keV)
- Energy scale and energy resolution
- Calibrations
- Stability of all the operating conditions.
- Selections of detectors and of data.
- Subtraction/rejection procedures and stability in time of all the selected windows and related quantities
- Efficiencies
- Definition of fiducial volume and non-uniformity
- Quenching factors, channeling, …
- …

Uncertainty in experimental parameters, as well as necessary assumptions on various related astrophysical, nuclear and particle-physics aspects, affect all the results at various extent, both in terms of exclusion plots and in terms of allowed regions/volumes. Thus comparisons with a fixed set of assumptions and parameters' values are intrinsically strongly uncertain.

No experiment can be directly compared in model independent way with DAMA

Examples of uncertainties in models and scenarios

see for some details e.g.:
Riv.N.Cim.26 n.1 (2003) 1, IJMPD13(2004)2127, EPJC47 (2006)263, IJMPA21 (2006)1445

Nature of the candidate and couplings

- WIMP class particles (neutrino, sneutrino, etc.): SI, SD, mixed SI&SD, preferred inelastic + e.m. contribution in the detection
- Light bosonic particles
- Kaluza-Klein particles
- Mirror dark matter
- Heavy Exotic candidate
- …etc. etc.

Halo models & Astrophysical scenario

- Isothermal sphere ⇒ very simple but unphysical halo model
- Many consistent halo models with different density and velocity distribution profiles can be considered with their own specific parameters (see e.g. PRD61(2000)023512)
- Caustic halo model
- Presence of non-thermalized DM particle components
- Streams due e.g. to satellite galaxies of the Milky Way (such as the Sagittarius Dwarf)
- Multi-component DM halo
- Clumpiness at small or large scale
- Solar Wakes
- …etc. …

Instrumental quantities

- Energy resolution
- Efficiencies
- Quenching factors
- Channeling effects
- Their dependence on energy
- …

Scaling laws
of cross sections for the case of recoiling nuclei

- Different scaling laws for different DM particle:

$\sigma_A \propto \mu^2 A^2 (1+\epsilon_A)$

$\epsilon_A = 0$ *generally assumed*

$\epsilon_A \approx \pm 1$ *in some nuclei? even* for neutralino candidate in MSSM (see Prezeau, Kamionkowski, Vogel et al., PRL91(2003)231301)

Form Factors
for the case of recoiling nuclei

- Many different profiles available in literature for each isotope
- Parameters to fix for the considered profiles
- Dependence on particle-nucleus interaction
- In SD form factors: no decoupling between nuclear and Dark Matter particles degrees of freedom + dependence on nuclear potential

Spin Factors
for the case of recoiling nuclei

- Calculations in different models give very different values also for the same isotope
- Depend on the nuclear potential models
- Large differences in the measured counting rate can be expected using:

  either SD not-sensitive isotopes

  or SD sensitive isotopes depending on the unpaired nucleon (compare e.g. odd spin isotopes of Xe, Te, Ge, Si, W with the ^{23}Na and ^{127}I cases).

Quenching Factor

- differences are present in different experimental determinations of *q* for the same nuclei in the same kind of detector depending on its specific features (e.g. *q* depends on dopant and on the impurities; in liquid noble gas e.g.on trace impurities, on presence of degassing/ releasing materials, on thermodynamical conditions, on possibly applied electric field, etc); assumed 1 in bolometers
- channeling effects possible increase at low energy in scintillators (dL/dx)
- possible larger values of *q* (AstropPhys33 (2010) 40)

→ energy dependence

… and more …

DAMA/NaI & DAMA/LIBRA vs possible positive hints 2010/2011





- **CoGeNT:** low-energy rise in the spectrum (irreducible by the applied background reduction procedures) + annual modulation





33 Jodi Cooley, SMU, CDMS Collaboration

- **CDMS:** after many data selections and cuts, 2 Ge candidate recoils survive in an exposure of 194.1 kg x day (0.8 estimated as expected from residual background)

- **CRESST:** after many data selections and cuts, 67 candidate recoils in the O/Ca bands survive in an exposure of 730 kg x day (expected residual background: 40-45 events, depending on minimization)



All those excesses are compatible with the DAMA 8.9 σ C.L. annual modulation result in various scenarios

Interpretation of the model independent DAMA results in the case of a DM candidate with SI coupling

Comparison of allowed regions and supersymmetric expectations (points and light blue region) in MSSM where:

- for the neutralino a dominant purely SI coupling is assumed
- the gaugino mass unification at GUT scale is released: $M_1/M_2 \neq 0.5$ (<) (where M_1 and M_2 U(1) and SU(2) gaugino masses)



DAMA allowed regions for a particular set of astrophysical, nuclear and particle Physics assumptions with and without channeling

CoGeNT and CRESST

If the two CDMS events are interpreted as relic neutralino interactions

Relic neutralino in effMSSM

Heavier Higgs boson in MSSM



DAMA allowed regions for a particular set of astrophysical, nuclear and particle Physics assumptions without (green), with (blue) channeling, with en.dep. Q.F.(red)



CoGeNT

CRESST

Another example of compatibility

DM particle with preferred inelastic interaction

In the Inelastic DM (iDM) scenario, WIMPs scatter into an excited state, split from the ground state by an energy comparable to the available kinetic energy of a Galactic WIMP.

$$\chi^- + N \rightarrow \chi^+ + N$$

- iDM has two mass states χ^+, χ^- with δ mass splitting
- Kinematical constraint for iDM

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu v^2 \geq \delta \Leftrightarrow v \geq v_{thr} = \sqrt{\frac{2\delta}{\mu}}$$

DAMA/NaI+DAMA/LIBRA Fund. Phys. 40(2010)900

Slices from the 3-dimensional allowed volume



iDM interaction on Iodine nuclei

iDM interaction on Tl nuclei of the NaI(Tl) dopant?

arXiv:1007.2688

- For large splittings, the dominant scattering in NaI (Tl) can occur off of Thallium nuclei, with A~205, which are present as a dopant at the 10^{-3} level in NaI(Tl) crystals.
- Inelastic scattering WIMPs with large splittings do not give rise to sizeable contribution on Na, I, Ge, Xe, Ca, O, … nuclei.

… and more considering experimental and theoretical uncertainties

Model-independent evidence by DAMA/NaI and DAMA/LIBRA well compatible with several candidates

(in many possible astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics scenarios)

- Low mass neutralino (PRD81(2010)107302, PRD83(2011)015001, arXiv:1003.0014,arXiv:1007.1005, arXiv:1009.0549, PRD84(2011)055014, arXiv:1112.5666, PRD85(2012)095013)
- Next-to-minimal models (JCAP0908(2009)032, PRD79(2009)023510, JCAP0706(2007)008, arXiv:1009.2555,1009.0549)
- Mirror DM in various scenarios (arXiv:1001.0096, 1106.2688, PRD82(2010)095001, JCAP1107(2011)009, JCAP1009(2010)022, arXiv:1203.2387)
- Light scalar WIMP through Higgs portal (PRD82(2010)043522, JCAP0810(2010)034)
- Isospin-Violating Dark Matter (JCAP1008(2010)018, arXiv:1102.4331,1105.3734)
- Sneutrino DM (JHEP0711(2007)029, arXiv:1105.4878)
- Inelastic DM (PRD79(2009)043513, arXiv:1007.2688)
- Resonant DM (arXiv:0909.2900)
- DM from exotic 4th generation quarks (arXiv:1002.3366)
- Cogent results (arXiv:1002.4703, 1106.0650)
- DM from exotic 4th generation quarks (arXiv:1002.3366)
- Composite DM (IJMPD19(2010)1385)
- iDM on Tl (arXiv:1007:2688)
- Specific two higgs doublet models (arXiv:1106.3368)
- exothermic DM (arXiv:1004.0937)
- Secluded WIMPs (PRD79(2009)115019)
- Asymmetric DM (arXiv:1105.5431)
- Leptophobic Z0 models (arXiv:1106.0885)
- SD Inelastic DM (arXiv:0912.4264)
- Complex Scalar Dark Matter (arXiv:1005.3328)
- Singlet DM (JHEP0905(2009)036, arXiv:1011.6377)
- Specific GU (arXiv:1106.3583)
- **Long range forces** (arXiv:1108.4661)

… and more (JCAP1008(2010)018, arXiv:1105.5121,1011.1499, arXiv:1108.1391, arXiv:1109.2722, arXiv:1110.5338, arXiv:1112.5457, …)

DAMA/LIBRA stage 2

Quantum Efficiency features



Residual Contamination

The limits are at 90% C.L.

PMT	Time (s)	Mass (kg)	^{226}Ra (Bq/kg)	^{234m}Pa (Bq/kg)	^{235}U (mBq/kg)	^{228}Ra (Bq/kg)	^{228}Th (mBq/kg)	^{40}K (Bq/kg)	^{137}Cs (mBq/kg)	^{60}Co (mBq/kg)
Average			*0.43*	-	*47*	*0.12*	*83*	*0.54*	-	-
Standard deviation			*0.06*	-	*10*	*0,02*	*17*	*0.16*	-	-

Energy resolution



σ/E @ 59.5 keV for each detector with **new PMTs** with higher quantum efficiency (**blu points**) and with previous PMT EMI-Electron Tube (red points).

The # of p.e./keV



Previous PMTs: ph.e./keV=5.5-7.5
New PMTs: **ph.e./keV up to 10**

JINST 7(2012)03009

Conclusions



- Positive evidence for the presence of DM particles in the galactic halo supported at 8.9 σ C.L. (13 annual cycles: 1.17 ton $\times$ yr)
- The modulation parameters determined with better precision
- Full sensitivity to many kinds of DM candidates and interactions both inducing recoils and/or e.m. radiation. That is not restricted to DM candidate inducing only nuclear recoils



- Possible positive hints in direct searches are compatible with DAMA in many scenarios; null searches not in robust conflict. Consider also the experimental and theoretical uncertainties. Indirect model dependent searches not in conflict

A new annual cycle will be released soon –
End of the DAMA/LIBRA – phase 1

- New PMTs with higher Q.E.: two annual cycles at hand…

DAMA/LIBRA – phase 2 perspectives

- ***Continuing data taking*** in the new configuration with lower software energy threshold (below 2 keV).
- New preamplifiers and trigger modules realized to further implement low energy studies.
- Suitable exposure planned in the new configuration to deeper study the nature of the particles and features of related astrophysical, nuclear and particle physics aspects.
- Investigation on dark matter peculiarities and second order effect
- Special data taking for other rare processes.