22. DARK MATTER

Written September 2003 by M. Drees (Technical University, Munich) and G. Gerbier (Saclay, CEA). Revised September 2005.

22.1. Theory

22.1.1. *Evidence for Dark Matter*:

The existence of Dark (*i.e.*, non-luminous and non-absorbing) Matter (DM) is by now well established. The earliest [1], and perhaps still most convincing, evidence for DM came from the observation that various luminous objects (stars, gas clouds, globular clusters, or entire galaxies) move faster than one would expect if they only felt the gravitational attraction of other visible objects. An important example is the measurement of galactic rotation curves. The rotational velocity v of an object on a stable Keplerian orbit with radius r around a galaxy scales like $v(r) \propto \sqrt{M(r)/r}$, where $M(r)$ is the mass inside the orbit. If r lies outside the visible part of the galaxy and mass tracks light, one would expect $v(r) \propto 1/\sqrt{r}$. Instead, in most galaxies one finds that v becomes approximately constant out to the largest values of r where the rotation curve can be measured; in our own galaxy, $v \simeq 220$ km/s at the location of our solar system, with little change out to the largest observable radius. This implies the existence of a *dark halo*, with mass density $\rho(r) \propto 1/r^2$, *i.e.*, $M(r) \propto r$; at some point ρ will have to fall off faster (in order to keep the total mass of the galaxy finite), but we do not know at what radius this will happen. This leads to a lower bound on the DM mass density, $\Omega_{\rm DM} \gtrsim 0.1$, where $\Omega_X \equiv \rho_X/\rho_{\rm crit}$, $\rho_{\rm crit}$ being the critical mass density (*i.e.*, $\Omega_{\rm tot} = 1$ corresponds to a flat Universe).

The observation of clusters of galaxies tends to give somewhat larger values, $\Omega_{\rm DM} \simeq 0.2$ to 0.3. These observations include measurements of the peculiar velocities of galaxies in the cluster, which are a measure of their potential energy if the cluster is virialized; measurements of the *X-ray* temperature of hot gas in the cluster, which again correlates with the gravitational potential felt by the gas; and—most directly—studies of (weak) gravitational lensing of background galaxies on the cluster.

The currently most accurate, if somewhat indirect, determination of $\Omega_{\rm DM}$ comes from global fits of cosmological parameters to a variety of observations; see the Section on Cosmological Parameters for details. For example, using measurements of the anisotropy of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) and of the spatial distribution of galaxies, Ref. 2 finds a density of cold, non–baryonic matter

$$\Omega_{\rm nbm} h^2 = 0.111 \pm 0.006 \; , \tag{22.1}$$

where h is the Hubble constant in units of 100 km/(s·Mpc). Some part of the baryonic matter density [2],

$$\Omega_{\rm b} h^2 = 0.023 \pm 0.001 \; , \tag{22.2}$$

may well contribute to (baryonic) DM, *e.g.*, MACHOs [3] or cold molecular gas clouds [4].

The DM density in the "neighborhood" of our solar system is also of considerable interest. This was first estimated as early as 1922 by J.H. Jeans, who analyzed the motion of nearby stars transverse to the galactic plane [1]. He concluded that in our galactic neighborhood the average density of DM must be roughly equal to that of luminous matter (stars, gas, dust). Remarkably enough, the most recent estimates, based on a detailed model of our galaxy, find quite similar results [5]:

CITATION: S. Eidelman *et al.*, Physics Letters **B592**, 1 (2004)

$$\rho_{\rm DM}^{\rm local} \simeq 0.3 \frac{\rm GeV}{\rm cm^3} \ ; \tag{22.3}$$

this value is known to within a factor of two or so.

22.1.2. *Candidates for Dark Matter*:

Analyses of structure formation in the Universe [6] indicate that most DM should be "cold", *i.e.*, should have been non-relativistic at the onset of galaxy formation (when there was a galactic mass inside the causal horizon). This agrees well with the upper bound [2] on the contribution of light neutrinos to Eq. (22.1),

$$\Omega_\nu h^2 \leq 0.0076 \quad 95\% \ {\rm CL} \tag{22.4}$$

Candidates for non-baryonic DM in Eq. (22.1) must satisfy several conditions: they must be stable on cosmological time scales (otherwise they would have decayed by now), they must interact very weakly with electromagnetic radiation (otherwise they wouldn't qualify as *dark* matter), and they must have the right relic density. Candidates include primordial black holes, axions, and weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs).

Primordial black holes must have formed before the era of Big-Bang nucleosynthesis, since otherwise they would have been counted in Eq. (22.2) rather than Eq. (22.1). Such an early creation of a large number of black holes is possible only in certain somewhat contrived cosmological models [7].

The existence of axions [8] was first postulated to solve the strong *CP* problem of QCD; they also occur naturally in superstring theories. They are pseudo Nambu-Goldstone bosons associated with the (mostly) spontaneous breaking of a new global "Peccei-Quinn" (PQ) U(1) symmetry at scale f_a; see the Section on Axions in this *Review* for further details. Although very light, axions would constitute cold DM, since they were produced non-thermally. At temperatures well above the QCD phase transition, the axion is massless, and the axion field can take any value, parameterized by the "misalignment angle" θ_i. At $T \lesssim 1$ GeV the axion develops a mass m_a due to instanton effects. Unless the axion field happens to find itself at the minimum of its potential ($\theta_i = 0$), it will begin to oscillate once m_a becomes comparable to the Hubble parameter H. These coherent oscillations transform the energy originally stored in the axion field into physical axion quanta. The contribution of this mechanism to the present axion relic density is [8]

$$\Omega_a h^2 = \kappa_a \left(f_a / 10^{12} \ {\rm GeV} \right)^{1.175} \theta_i^2 \ , \tag{22.5}$$

where the numerical factor κ_a lies roughly between 0.5 and a few. If $\theta_i \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, Eq. (22.5) will saturate Eq. (22.1) for $f_a \sim 10^{11}$ GeV, comfortably above laboratory and astrophysical constraints [8]; this would correspond to an axion mass around 0.1 meV. However, if the post-inflationary reheat temperature $T_R > f_a$, cosmic strings will form during the PQ phase transition at $T \simeq f_a$. Their decay will give an additional contribution to Ω_a, which is often bigger than that in Eq. (22.5) [9], leading to a smaller preferred value of f_a, *i.e.*, larger m_a. On the other hand, values of f_a near the Planck scale become possible if θ_i is for some reason very small.

Weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs) χ are particles with mass roughly between 10 GeV and a few TeV, and with cross sections of approximately weak strength. Their present relic density can be calculated reliably if the WIMPs were in thermal and chemical equilibrium with the hot "soup" of Standard Model (SM) particles after inflation. In this case their density would become exponentially (Boltzmann) suppressed at $T < m_\chi$. The WIMPs therefore drop out of thermal equilibrium ("freeze out") once the rate of reactions that change SM particles into WIMPs or vice versa, which is proportional to the product of the WIMP number density and the WIMP pair annihilation cross section into SM particles σ_A times velocity, becomes smaller than the Hubble expansion rate of the Universe. After freeze out, the co-moving WIMP density remains essentially constant. Their present relic density is then approximately given by (ignoring logarithmic corrections) [10]

$$\Omega_\chi h^2 \simeq const. \cdot \frac{T_0^3}{M_{\rm Pl}^3 \langle \sigma_A v \rangle} \simeq \frac{0.1\ \mathrm{pb} \cdot c}{\langle \sigma_A v \rangle} \, . \tag{22.6}$$

Here T_0 is the current CMB temperature, $M_{\rm Pl}$ is the Planck mass, c is the speed of light, σ_A is the total annihilation cross section of a pair of WIMPs into SM particles, v is the relative velocity between the two WIMPs in their cms system, and $\langle \ldots \rangle$ denotes thermal averaging. Freeze out happens at temperature $T_F \simeq m_\chi/20$ almost independently of the properties of the WIMP. This means that WIMPs are already non-relativistic when they decouple from the thermal plasma; it also implies that Eq. (22.6) is applicable if $T_R \gtrsim m_\chi/10$. Notice that the 0.1 pb in Eq. (22.6) contains factors of T_0 and $M_{\rm Pl}$; it is therefore quite intriguing that it "happens" to come out near the typical size of weak interaction cross sections.

The seemingly most obvious WIMP candidate is a heavy neutrino. However, an SU(2) doublet neutrino will have too small a relic density if its mass exceeds $M_Z/2$, as required by LEP data. One can suppress the annihilation cross section, and hence increase the relic density, by postulating mixing between a heavy SU(2) doublet and some "sterile" SU(2) × U(1)$_Y$ singlet neutrino. However, one also has to require the neutrino to be stable; it is not obvious why a massive neutrino should not be allowed to decay.

The currently best motivated WIMP candidate is therefore the lightest superparticle (LSP) in supersymmetric models [11] with exact R-parity (which guarantees the stability of the LSP). Searches for exotic isotopes [12] imply that a stable LSP has to be neutral. This leaves basically two candidates among the superpartners of ordinary particles, a sneutrino, and a neutralino. Sneutrinos again have quite large annihilation cross sections; their masses would have to exceed several hundred GeV for them to make good DM candidates. This is uncomfortably heavy for the lightest sparticle, in view of naturalness arguments. Moreover, the negative outcome of various WIMP searches (see below) rules out "ordinary" sneutrinos as primary component of the DM halo of our galaxy. (In models with gauge-mediated SUSY breaking the lightest "messenger sneutrino" could make a good WIMP [13].) The most widely studied WIMP is therefore the lightest neutralino. Detailed calculations [14] show that the lightest neutralino will have the desired thermal relic density Eq. (22.1) in at least four distinct regions of parameter space. χ could be (mostly) a bino or photino (the superpartner of the $\mathrm{U}(1)_Y$ gauge boson and photon, respectively), if both χ and some sleptons have mass below ~ 150 GeV, or if m_χ is close to the mass of some sfermion (so that its relic density is reduced through co-annihilation with this sfermion), or if $2m_\chi$ is close to the mass of the *CP*-odd Higgs boson present in supersymmetric models [15]. Finally, Eq. (22.1) can also be satisfied if χ has a large higgsino component.

Although WIMPs are attractive DM candidates because their thermal relic density naturally has at least the right order of magnitude, non-thermal production mechanisms have also been suggested, *e.g.*, LSP production from the decay of some moduli fields [16], from the decay of the inflaton [17], or from the decay of "$Q-$balls" (non-topological solitons) formed in the wake of Affleck-Dine baryogenesis [18]. Although LSPs from these sources are typically highly relativistic when produced, they quickly achieve kinetic (but not chemical) equilibrium if T_R exceeds a few MeV [19](but stays below $m_\chi/20$). They therefore also contribute to cold DM.

Primary black holes (as MACHOs), axions, and WIMPs are all (in principle) detectable with present or near-future technology (see below). There are also particle physics DM candidates which currently seem almost impossible to detect. These include the gravitino (the spin-3/2 superpartner of the graviton) [20], states from the "hidden sector" thought responsible for supersymmetry breaking [13], and the axino (the spin-1/2 superpartner of the axion) [21].

22.2. Experimental detection of Dark Matter

22.2.1. *The case of baryonic matter in our galaxy*:

The search for hidden galactic baryonic matter in the form of MAssive Compact Halo Objects (MACHOs) has been initiated following the suggestion that they may represent a large part of the galactic DM and could be detected through the microlensing effect [3]. The MACHO, EROS, and OGLE collaborations have performed a program of observation of such objects by monitoring the luminosity of millions of stars in the Large and Small Magellanic Clouds for several years. EROS concluded that MACHOs cannot contribute more than 20% to the mass of the galactic halo [22], while MACHO observed a signal at 0.4 solar mass and put an upper limit of 40%. Overall, this strengthens the need for non-baryonic DM, also supported by the arguments developed above.

22.2.2. *Axion searches*:

Axions can be detected by looking for $a \to \gamma$ conversion in a strong magnetic field [23]. Such a conversion proceeds through the loop-induced $a\gamma\gamma$ coupling, whose strength $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ is an important parameter of axion models. Currently two experiments searching for axionic DM are taking data. They both employ high quality cavities. The cavity "Q factor" enhances the conversion rate on resonance, *i.e.*, for $m_a c^2 = \hbar\omega_{\mathrm{res}}$. One then needs to scan the resonance frequency in order to cover a significant range in m_a or, equivalently, f_a. The bigger of the two experiments, situated at the LLNL in California [24], started taking data in the first half of 1996. It uses very sophisticated "conventional" electronic amplifiers with very low noise temperature to enhance the conversion signal. Their published results [25] exclude axions with mass between 1.9 and 3.3 μeV, corresponding to $f_a \simeq 4 \cdot 10^{13}$ GeV, as a major component of the dark halo of our galaxy, if $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ is near the upper end of the theoretically expected range.

The smaller "CARRACK" experiment now under way in Kyoto, Japan [26] uses Rydberg atoms (atoms excited to a very high state, $n \simeq 230$) to detect the microwave photons that would result from axion conversion. This allows almost noise-free detection of single photons. Preliminary results of the CARRACK I experiment [27] exclude axions with mass in a narrow range around 10 μeV as major component of the galactic dark halo for some plausible range of $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ values. This experiment is being upgraded to CARRACK II, which intends to probe the range between 2 and 50 μeV with sensitivity to all plausible axion models, if axions form most of DM [27].

22.2.3. *Basics of direct WIMP search*:

As stated above, WIMPs should be gravitationally trapped inside galaxies and should have the adequate density profile to account for the observed rotational curves. These two constraints determine the main features of experimental detection of WIMPs, which have been detailed in the reviews [28].

Their mean velocity inside our galaxy is expected to be similar to that of stars around the center of the galaxy, *i.e.*, a few hundred kilometers per second at the location of our solar system. For these velocities, WIMPs interact with ordinary matter through elastic scattering on nuclei. With expected WIMP masses in the range 10 GeV to 10 TeV, typical nuclear recoil energies are of order of 1 to 100 keV.

The shape of the nuclear recoil spectrum results from a convolution of the WIMP velocity distribution, usually taken as a shifted Maxwellian distribution, with the angular scattering distribution, which is isotropic to first approximation but forward-peaked for high nuclear mass (typically higher than Ge mass) due to the nuclear form factor. Overall, this results in a roughly exponential spectrum. The higher the WIMP mass, the higher the mean value of the exponential. This points to the need for low nuclear energy threshold detectors.

On the other hand, expected interaction rates depend on the product of the WIMP local flux and the interaction cross section. The first term is fixed by the local density of dark matter, taken as 0.3 GeV/cm^3 (see above), the mean WIMP velocity, typically 220 km/s, and the mass of the WIMP. The expected interaction rate then mainly depends on two unknowns, the mass and cross section of WIMP (with some uncertainty [5] due to the halo model). This is why the experimental observable, which is basically the scattering rate as a function of energy, is usually expressed as a contour in the WIMP mass—cross section plane.

The cross section depends on the nature of the couplings. For non-relativistic WIMPs one in general has to distinguish spin–independent and spin–dependent couplings. The former can involve scalar and vector WIMP and nucleon currents (vector currents are absent for Majorana WIMPs, e.g. the neutralino), while the latter involve axial vector currents (and obviously only exist if χ carries spin). Due to coherence effects the spin–independent cross section scales approximately as the square of the mass of the nucleus, so higher mass nuclei, from Ge to Xe, are preferred for this search. For spin-dependent coupling, the cross section depends on the nuclear spin factor; the useful target nuclei are ^{19}F and ^{127}I.

Cross sections calculated in MSSM models induce rates of at most 1 evt day^{-1} kg^{-1} of detector, much lower than the usual radioactive backgrounds. This indicates the need for underground laboratories to protect against cosmic ray induced backgrounds, and for the selection of extremely radiopure materials.

The typical shape of exclusion contours can be anticipated from this discussion: at low WIMP mass, the sensitivity drops because of the detector energy threshold, whereas at high masses, the sensitivity also decreases because, for a fixed mass density, the WIMP flux decreases $\propto 1/m_{\chi}$. The sensitivity is best for WIMP masses near the mass of the recoiling nucleus.

22.2.4. *Status and prospects of direct WIMP searches*:

The first searches have been performed with ultra-pure semiconductors installed in pure lead and copper shields in underground environments [29]. Combining a priori excellent energy resolutions and very pure detector material, they produced the first limits on WIMP searches and until recently had the best performance (Heidelberg-Moscow, IGEX, COSME-II, HDMS) [29]. Without positive identification of nuclear recoil events, however, these experiments could only set limits, *e.g.*, excluding sneutrinos as major component of the galactic halo. Still, planned experiments using several tens of kgs to a ton of Germanium (many of which were designed for double-beta decay search)—GENIUS TF, GEDEON, MAJORANA—are based on only passive reduction of the external and internal electromagnetic, and neutron background by using segmented detectors, minimal detector housing, close electronics, and large liquid nitrogen shields.

To make further progress, active background rejection and signal identification questions have to be addressed. This has been the focus of many recent investigations and improvements. Active background rejection in detectors relies on the relatively small ionization in nuclear recoils due to their low velocity. This induces a reduction—quenching—of the ionization/scintillation signal for nuclear recoil signal events relative to e or γ induced backgrounds. Energies calibrated with gamma sources are then called "electron equivalent energies" (eee). This effects has been calculated and measured [29]. It is exploited in cryogenic detectors described later. In scintillation detectors, it induces in addition a difference in decay times of pulses induced by e/γ events vs nuclear recoils. Due to the limited resolution and discrimination power of this technique at low energies, this effect allows only a statistical background rejection. It has been used in NaI(Tl) (DAMA, NAIAD, Saclay NaI), in CsI(Tl)(KIMS), Xe (ZEPLIN) [29]. No observation of nuclear recoils has been reported by these experiments.

There are two experimental signatures of WIMP detection that would prove its astrophysical origin. One is the measurement of the strong daily forward/backward asymmetry of the nuclear recoil direction, due to the alternate sweeping of the WIMP cloud by the rotating Earth. Detection of this effect requires gaseous detectors or anisotropic response scintillators (stilbene). The second is the few percent annual modulation of the recoil rate due to the Earth speed adding to or subtracting from the speed of the Sun. This tiny effect can only be detected with large masses; nuclear recoil identification should also be performed, as the much larger background may also be subject to modulation.

The DAMA experiment operating 100 kg of NaI(Tl) in Gran Sasso has observed, with a statistical significance of 6.3 σ, an annually modulated signal with the expected phase, over a period of 7 years with a total exposure of around 100 000 kg·d , in the 2 to 6 keV (eee) energy interval [30]. This effect is attributed to a WIMP signal by the authors. If interpreted within the standard halo model described above, it would require a WIMP with $m_\chi \simeq 50$ GeV and $\sigma_{\chi p} \simeq 7 \cdot 10^{-6}$ pb (central values). This interpretation has however several unaddressed implications. In particular, the expected nuclear recoil rate from WIMPs should be of the order of 50% of the total measured rate in the 2–3 keV (eee) bin and 7% in the 4–6 keV (eee) bin. The rather large WIMP signal should be detectable by the pulse shape analysis. Moreover, the remaining, presumably e/γ induced, background would have to rise with energy; no explanation for this is given by the authors.

Annual modulation has also been searched for by NaI-32 (Zaragoza), DEMOS (Ge), ELEGANTS (NaI) [29]. No signal has been seen in these experiments, but their sensitivity is too low to contradict DAMA.

New limits on the spin independent coupling of WIMPs were obtained by the CDMS collaboration which has operated Ge cryogenics detectors at the Soudan mine [31]. They supercede the earlier results of EDELWEISS also obtained with Ge cryogenics detectors in the deep underground Fréjus lab [32]. The simultaneous measurement of the phonon signal and the ionization signal in such semiconductor detectors permits event by event discrimination between nuclear and electronic recoils down to 5 to 10 keV recoil energy. In addition, the advanced rejection technique allowed CDMS to reject surface detector interactions, which mimic nuclear recoils. Assuming conventional WIMP halo parameters described above and spin independent coupling WIMP interactions, the CDMS limit and DAMA signal are clearly incompatible. Varying the halo parameters, and/or including spin–dependent interactions compatible with the neutrino flux limit from the Sun, does not allow reconciliation of both results without finetuning [33]. The obtained sensitivity of $\sigma_{\chi p} \simeq few \times 10^{-7}$ pb tests most optimistic cross sections that can be accommodated in the MSSM [34].

CDMS also provides the best sensitivity for spin dependent WIMP-neutron interactions thanks to the ^{73}Ge (^{29}Si) content of natural Germanium (Silicon) [35].

Other cryogenic experiments like CRESST and ROSEBUD [36] use the scintillation of $CaWO_4$ as second variable for background discrimination, while CUORICINO will use TeO_2 in the purely thermal mode. The cryogenic experimental programs of CDMS II, EDELWEISS II, CRESST II, CUORICINO, and ROSEBUD [36] intend to increase their sensitivity by a factor 100, by operating from a few to 40 kg of detectors.

Liquid or two-phase Xenon detectors are coming on line. ZEPLIN has been operating 6 kg in the Boulby laboratory for about 1 year and announced a sensitivity close to that of EDELWEISS [37]. With only 1.5 photoelectron/keV (eee), and a three-fold coincidence, searching for the WIMP signal in the 2–10 keV (eee) region is quite challenging. In particular, the neutron recoil discrimination calibration results do not appear to be convincing enough to consider the limits set on the WIMP signal to be as reliable as the ones set by the cryogenic experiments cited above. With masses of 7 to 30 kg, ZEPLIN II and III aim at sensitivities down to 10^{-8} pb, while XMASS in Japan has operated a 100 kg detector at the SuperKamiokande site, and demonstrated the self-shielding effect to lower the background [29]. They intend to ultimately operate 800 kg while XENON in US has approximately the same program.

On the other hand, the extended version of DAMA, LIBRA, has started operating 250 kg of NaI(Tl) in Gran Sasso, ANAIS will operate 107 kg of NaI(Tl) in Canfranc laboratory, KIMS, 80 kg of CsI(Tl)in Yang Yang lab in Korea, and ELEGANTS VI the large shield of 750 kg of NaI(Tl) [29].

There is also continuous work in the development of a low pressure Time Projection Chamber, the only convincing technique to measure the direction of nuclear recoils [38]. DRIFT, a 1m^3 volume detector has been operated underground but did not obtain competitive results. The sub-keV energy threshold gaseous detector MICROMEGAS is being investigated for WIMP searches [38]. Other exotic techniques include the superheated droplet detectors SIMPLE, PICASSO, which has started to obtain interesting limits, and an ultra cold pure ^{3}He detector (MacHe3) has been operated with a very small sensitive mass [29].

Sensitivities down to $\sigma_{\chi p}$ of 10^{-10} pb, as needed to probe large regions of MSSM parameter space [34], can be reached with detectors of typical masses of 1 ton [36], assuming nearly perfect background discrimination capabilities. Note that the expected WIMP rate is then 5 evts/ton/year for Ge. The ultimate neutron background will only be identified by its multiple interactions in a finely segmented or multiple interaction sensitive detector, and/or by operating detectors containing different target materials within the same set–up. Information on various neutron backgrounds calculations and measurements can be found in [39]. With an intermediate mass of 10 to 30 kg and less efficient multiple interaction detection, a muon veto seems mandatory.

22.2.5. *Status and prospects of indirect WIMP searches*:

WIMPs can annihilate and their annihilation products can be detected; these include neutrinos, gamma rays, positrons, antiprotons, and antinuclei [40]. These methods are complementary to direct detection and can explore higher masses and different coupling scenarios. "Smoking gun" signals for indirect detection are neutrinos coming from the center of the Sun or Earth, and monoenergetic photons from the halo.

WIMPs can be slowed down, captured, and trapped in celestial objects like the Earth or the Sun, thus enhancing their density and their probability of annihilation. This is a source of muon neutrinos which can interact in the Earth. Upward going muons can then be detected in large neutrino telescopes such as MACRO, BAKSAN, SuperKamiokande, Baikal, AMANDA, ANTARES, NESTOR, and the future large sensitive area IceCube [40]. The best upper limits, of $\simeq$ 1000 muons/km2/year, have been set recently by SuperKamiokande [41]. However, at least in the framework of the MSSM and with standard halo velocity profiles, only the limits from the Sun are competitive with direct WIMP search limits. ANTARES (IceCube) will increase this sensitivity respectively by $\simeq$ one (two) order(s) of magnitude.

WIMP annihilation in the halo can give a continuous spectrum of gamma rays and (at one-loop level) also monoenergetic photon contributions from the $\gamma\gamma$ and γZ channels. The size of this signal depends very strongly on the halo model, but is expected to be most prominent towards the galactic center. Existing limits come from the EGRET satellite below 10 GeV, and from the WHIPPLE ground based telescope above 100 GeV [42]. However, only the planned space mission GLAST will be able to provide competitive SUSY sensitivities in both the continuous and γ line channels. Also, Atmospheric Cherenkov Telescopes like MAGIC, VERITAS, and H.E.S.S. should be able to test some SUSY models, at large WIMP mass, for halo models showing a significant WIMP enhancement at the galactic center [40]. H.E.S.S. has actually recently observed TeV gamma rays from the galactic center. The original data [43] would have been compatible with a WIMP signal if its mass exceeds 12 TeV. Newer data presented at the 2005 ICRC in Pune, India, show a featureless spectrum, well described by a power law, extending beyond 20 TeV. Similarly, at the other end of the mass spectrum, a WIMP mass below 20 MeV would be required to explain the excess of 511 keV gamma rays from galactic center observed by INTEGRAL [44]. Astrophysical sources are likely to be the explanations of these excesses.

Diffuse continuum gammas could also give a signature due to their isotropic halo origin. The excess of GeV gamma-rays observed by EGRET [42] and attributed to a possible WIMP signal could however be due to classical sources.

Antiprotons arise as another WIMP annihilation product in the halo. The signal is expected to be detectable above background only at very low energies. The BESS balloon-borne experiment indeed observed antiprotons below 1 GeV [45]. However, the uncertainties in the calculation of the expected signal and background energy spectra are too large to reach a firm conclusion. Precision measurements by the future experiments BESS, AMS2, and PAMELA may allow one to disentangle signal and background [40].

A cosmic-ray positron flux excess at around 8 GeV measured by HEAT [46] has given rise to numerous calculations and conjectures concerning a possible SUSY interpretation. The need for an ad-hoc “boost” of expected flux to match the observed one and the failure to reproduce the energy shape by including a component from WIMP annihilation are illustrative of the difficulty to assign a Dark Matter origin to such measurements.

Last but not least, an antideuteron signal [47], as potentially observable by AMS2 or PAMELA, could constitute a signal for WIMP annihilation in the halo.

An interesting comparison of respective sensitivities to MSSM parameter space of future direct and various indirect searches has been performed with the DARKSUSY tool [48]. Searching for neutrinos from the Sun tests the spin-dependent WIMP couplings to matter, whereas direct searches are mostly sensitive to spin-independent couplings. Moreover, γ line searches are sensitive to higgsino-like neutralinos, whereas direct detection methods are more sensitive to gaugino-like neutralinos. However, it should be kept in mind that interpretations of excess in the halo or in the galactic center as being due to signals for WIMP annihilation strongly depend on details of the halo model.

Numerous new experiments are in line to bring accurate measurements to constrain or discover Dark Matter.

References:

1. For a brief but delightful history of DM, see V. Trimble, in Proceedings of the *First International Symposium on Sources of Dark Matter in the Universe*, Bel Air, California, 1994; published by World Scientific, Singapore (ed. D.B. Cline), see also a recent review : G. Bertone, D. Hooper and J. Silk,.
2. See *Global cosmological parameters* in this *Review.*
3. B. Paczynski, Astrophys. J. **304**, 1 (1986);
   K. Griest, Astrophys. J. **366**, 412 (1991).
4. F. De Paolis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 14 (1995).
5. M. Kamionkowski and A. Kinkhabwala, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 3256 (1998).
6. See *e.g.*, J.R. Primack, in the Proceedings of *Midrasha Mathematicae in Jerusalem: Winter School in Dynamical Systems*, Jerusalem, Israel, January 1997, `astro-ph/9707285` . There is currently some debate whether cold DM models correctly reproduce the DM density profile near the center of galactic haloes. See *e.g.*, R.A. Swaters *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **583**, 732 (2003).
7. B.J. Carr and S.W. Hawking, MNRAS **168**, 399 (1974).
8. See *Axions and other Very Light Bosons* in this *Review.*
9. R.A. Battye and E.P.S. Shellard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2954 (1994);
   Erratum-ibid. **76**, 2203 (1996).
10. E.W. Kolb and M.E. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Addison-Wesley (1990).
11. For a review, see G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski, and K. Griest, Phys. Reports **267**, 195 (1996).
12. See *Searches for WIMPs and other Particles* in this *Review.*
13. S. Dimopoulos, G.F. Giudice, and A. Pomarol, Phys. Lett. **B389**, 37 (1996).
14. See *e.g.*, J.R. Ellis *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B652**, 259 (2003);
    J.R. Ellis *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B565**, 176 (2003);
    H. Baer *et al.*, JHEP **0306**, 054 (2003);
    A. Bottino *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 043506 (2003).
15. G. Griest and D. Seckel, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 3191 (1991).
16. T. Moroi and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. **B570**, 455 (2000).
17. R. Allahverdi and M. Drees, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 091302 (2002).
18. M. Fujii and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B542**, 80 (2002).
19. J. Hisano, K. Kohri, and M.M. Nojiri, Phys. Lett. **B505**, 169 (2001);
    X. Chen, M. Kamionkowski, and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 021302 (2001).
20. M. Bolz, W. Buchmüller, and M. Plümacher, Phys. Lett. **B443**, 209 (1998).

21. L. Covi *et al.*, JHEP **0105**, 033 (2001).
22. MACHO Collab., C. Alcock *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **542**, 257 (2000);
    EROS Collab., AA 355, 39 (2000);
    OGLE Collab., AA 343, 10 (1999).
23. P. Sikivie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1415 (1983), Erratum-ibid. **52**, 695 (1984).
24. H. Peng *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A444**, 569 (2000).
25. S. Asztalos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 011101 (2004).
26. M. Tada *et al.*, `physics/0101028` .
27. K. Yamamoto *et al.*, in *Heidelberg 2000, Dark matter in astro— and particle—physics*, `hep-ph/0101200` .
28. P.F. Smith and J.D. Lewin, Phys. Reports **187**, 203 (1990);
    J.R. Primack, D. Seckel, and B. Sadoulet, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **38** 751 (1988).
29. For recent reviews on non cryogenic detectors, see *e.g.*, A. Morales, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B138** 135 (2005).;
    Proceedings of Topics in Astroparticles and Underground Physics TAUP 2003, Nucl. Phys B (Proc. Suppl.) vol. 138 (2005);
    Proceedings of *Identification of Dark Matter.* IDM 2002, World Scientific, ed. N. Spooner and V. Kudryavtsev, (York, UK, 2002).
30. DAMA Collab., R. Bernabei *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B480**, 23 (2000), and Riv. Nuovo Cimento **26**, 1 (2003).
31. CDMS Collab., D.S. Akerib *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 211301 (2004).
32. EDELWEISS Collab., A. Benoit *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 122002 (2005).
33. C.J. Copi and L.M. Krauss, Phys. Rev. **67**, 103507 (2003); G. Gelmini and P. Gondolo, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 123520 (2005);
    A. Kurylov and M. Kamionkowski, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 063503 (2004);
    C.J. Copi and L.M. Krauss, New Astron. Rev. **49**, 185 (2005).
34. For a general introduction to SUSY, see the section devoted in this *Review of Particle Physics.* For a review on cross sections for direct detection, see J. Ellis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 123502 (2003) and for a recent update Phys. Rev. **D71**, 095007 (2005).
35. C. Savage, P. Gondolo and K. Freese, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 123513 (2004).
36. For a recent review on cryogenic detectors, see *e.g.*, W. Seidel, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B138** 130 (2005). In addition to the TAUP and IDM Conference Proceedings, see also the Proceedings of *Int. Workshop on Low Temperature Detectors*, LTD10, NIM A ,(2003).
37. UKDMC collab, G.J. Alner *et al.*, Astropart. Phys. **23** 444 (2005).
38. Workshop on large TPC for low energy rare event detection, Paris, December 2004, `http://www.unine.ch/phys/tpc.html` .
39. These sites gather informations on neutrons from various underground labs:
    `http://www.physics.ucla.edu/wimps/nBG/nBG.html`;

`http://ilias-darkmatter.uni-tuebingen.de/BSNS_WG.html`.

40. L. Bergstrom, Rept. on Prog. in Phys. **63**, 793 (2000);
    L. Bergstrom *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 043506 (1999);
    C. Tao, Phys. Scripta **T93**, 82 (2001);
    Y.Mambrini and C. Muoz, Journ. of Cosm. And Astrop. Phys., **10**, 3(2004).
41. Super K. collaboration, S. Desai *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 109901 (2004).
42. EGRET Collab., D. Dixon *et al.*, New Astron. **3**, 539 (1998).
43. D. Horns, Phys. Lett. **B607**, 225 (2005).
44. C. Bohem *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 101301 (2004).
45. BESS Collab., S. Orito *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1078 (2000).
46. HEAT Collab., S. W. Barwick *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **482**, L191 (2000).
47. F. Donato, N. Fornengo and P. Salati, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 043003 (2000).
48. DARKSUSY site: `http://www.physto.se/ edsjo/darksusy/` .