Constraints on dark matter powered stars from the extragalactic background light

Andreas Maurer, Tanja Kneiske, Martin Raue

in cooperation with: Dominik Elsässer, Peter Hauschildt, Dieter Horns

12.10.2010 AT-Schule Obertrubach-Bärnfels



http://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/

Constraints on DS from the EBL

Astrophysical evidence for dark matter

Properties of (astrophysical) dark matter

 Large scale structure data (e.g. 2dF, SDSS) and N-body simulations (e.g. Millenium Run) ⇒ COLD



Figure: Measured (blue) and simulated (red) large scale galaxy distribution

Astrophysical evidence for dark matter

Properties of (astrophysical) dark matter

- Large scale structure data (e.g. 2dF, SDSS) and N-body simulations (e.g. Millenium Run) ⇒ COLD
- Rotational curves of galaxies, gravitational lensing, galaxy clusters ⇒ DARK



Figure: Gravitational lensing: image from Colley *et al.* (1996), matter distribution reconstruction from Tyson *et al.* (1998)

Astrophysical evidence for dark matter

Properties of (astrophysical) dark matter

- Large scale structure data (e.g. 2dF, SDSS) and N-body simulations (e.g. Millenium Run) ⇒ COLD
- Rotational curves of galaxies, gravitational lensing, galaxy clusters ⇒ DARK
- Bullet cluster
 → NON-BARYONIC



Figure: Bullet cluster, red: baryons, blue: dark matter (Clowe *et al.* 2006)

Influence of DM on first stars

- Self-annihilating dark matter e.g. WIMPs $(m_{\chi} = 1 \text{ GeV} - 10 \text{ TeV}, \langle \sigma v \rangle_{ann} = 3 \cdot 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$
- High dark matter density inside a star

•
$$L_{\text{DM}} \approx \frac{2}{3} \int \rho_{\chi}^2 \frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{ann}}}{m_{\chi}} \mathrm{d}V > L_{\text{nuclear}}$$

 → First stars are good candidates! (Spolyar *et al.* 2008; locco *et al.* 2008)

AC vs. DM capture



Figure: Left: Adiabatic contracted DM annihilates inside a forming Dark Star (from T. Kneiske, talk @ COSPAR 2010). Right: Scattering processes lead to an high DM density inside the DS (from F. locco, talk @ Astroparticle seminar, Hamburg 2010)

Overview Dark Stars



Figure: Sketch of a Dark Star next to a "normal" star (picture by T. Kneiske)

Properties of DS						
	Sun	Dark Stars				
Т	5778 K	\sim 5000 $-$ 15000 K				
L_{\odot} / M_{\odot}	1	$\sim 10^{2-5}$				
∆t	$\sim 4.5\cdot 10^9$ years	$\sim 10^{5-9}$ years				
$\log_{10}(g)_{[\log_{10}({\rm cm\ s^{-2}})]}$	4.44	~ -0.7 to 5.5				

How to detect them?

- Direct detection can be very difficult (Zackrisson *et al.* 2010a)
- Our approach: extragalatic background light (EBL)
- EBL is isotropic, diffuse radiation field between \sim 0.1 (a few)100 μm containing informations of star formation history
- Signatures of Dark Stars in the EBL density opens new wavelength range for indirect dark matter search
- Advantage: EBL is sensitive to many faint sources
- Disadvantage: EBL is sensitive to many faint sources

Multiwavelength data of diffuse background radiation



Figure: Spectrum of the cosmic background radiations from T. Kneiske, talk @ COSPAR 2010

Recent data of the EBL and their origin



- Integrated, redshifted em-radiation from all epochs
- Direct measurements, lower limits, upper limits
- Peaks: \sim 1 μ m (stars) and \sim 200 μ m (dust)

Figure: EBL data based on a collection by Mazin & Raue (2007) updated regularly. EBL model by Kneiske *et al.* (2004)

EBL contribution model: Emissivity

Method

- Calculating the (possible) contribution from Dark Stars to the EBL density
- using a Forward evolution model (see e.g. Hauser & Dwek 2001), assuming minimal radiative transfer (e.g. no reprocessing)
- Concordance ACDM cosmological model

Emissivity - comoving luminosity density

$$\varepsilon_{\nu}(z) = \int_{z}^{z_{max}} L_{\nu}(t(z) - t(z'))\dot{\rho}_{*}(z') \left| \frac{dt}{dz'} \right| dz'$$

$$L_{\nu}(t(z) - t(z')) = L_{\nu} = \text{constant for } t(z) - t(z') \le \Delta t_{DS}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_{*}(z) = \text{SFR}_{Norm}[\Theta(z - z_{min}) - \Theta(z - z_{max})]$$

Dark Star spectra calculated with the PHOENIX code

(Hauschildt & Baron 2006)





DS parameters from Spolyar et al. (2009)

Star formation rates: Our model vs. simulations



Figure: POPIII SFR from Trenti & Stiavelli (2009)

EBL density - redshifted integrated luminosity density

$$P_{\nu}(z) = \nu I_{\nu}(z) = \nu \frac{c}{4\pi} \int_{z}^{z_{max}} \varepsilon_{\nu'}(z') \left| \frac{dt}{dz'} \right| dz'$$
$$\nu' = \nu \left(\frac{1+z'}{1+z} \right)$$

Cosmological parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{dt}{dz} \right| &= \frac{1}{H_0(1+z)E(z)} \\ E(z)^2 &= \Omega_r(1+z)^4 + \Omega_m(1+z)^3 + \Omega_k(1+z)^2 + \Omega_\Lambda \end{aligned}$$

Calculation of the EBL signatures of Dark Stars



Figure: EBL density: PH 5kK vs. PH7.5 kK

Dark Star parameter space

Parameters				
	Parameter	minimal	maximal	
	⊿t _{DS}	10 ⁵ years	10 ⁹ years	
	z _{min} ^a	5	15	
	(D)SFR _{Norm} ^b	10 ⁻⁷	10 ⁻³	
	Luminosity to mass ratio ^c	$10^2 L_{\odot}/M_{\odot}$	$10^5~L_\odot/M_\odot$	

^asee e.g. Trenti *et al.* (2009); Maio *et al.* (2010)
 ^bobtained by using POP III SFR from Trenti & Stiavelli (2009)
 ^ccalculated from different DS models by locco *et al.* (2008); Spolyar *et al.* (2009); Freese *et al.* (2010)

Effect of different DS formation rates



Figure: Dark Star EBL contribution for DS: $T_{DS} = 7500 \text{ K}, M_{DS} = 690 \text{ M}_{\odot}, R_{DS} = 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$

Effect of different minimum z formation steps



Figure: Dark Star EBL contribution for DS: $T_{DS} = 7500 \text{ K}$, $M_{DS} = 690 \text{ M}_{\odot}$, $R_{DS} = 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$

Effect of different DS lifetimes



Figure: Dark Star EBL contribution for DS: $T_{DS} = 7500 \text{ K}$, $M_{DS} = 690 \text{ M}_{\odot}$, $R_{DS} = 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$

Maximum EBL density [nW m ^{-2} sr ^{-1}]					
	5 kK DS	7.5 kK DS			
Minimal					
$z_{min} = 15, \text{ SFR}_{Norm} = 10^{-7}, \Delta t_{DS} = 10^5 \text{ years}$	$\sim 3.5 imes 10^{-8}$	$\sim 7.2 imes 10^{-9}$			
Medium					
$z_{min} = 10$, SFR _{Norm} = 10^{-5} , $\Delta t_{DS} = 10^7$ years	$\sim 8.2 imes 10^{-4}$	$\sim 1.7 imes 10^{-4}$			
Maximum					
$z_{min} = 5$, SFR _{Norm} = 10^{-3} , $\Delta t_{DS} = 10^9$ years	\sim 63	\sim 13			

Calculated EBL density vs. data



Figure: Maximum EBL contribution scenarios of DS parameters, EBL model by Kneiske *et al.* 2004 (black dashed line)

Summary & Outlook

- EBL offers a new possibility to search for DS / constrain DS parameter space
- Calculated contributions from DS to the EBL density
- $\bullet\,$ EBL density ranges from $\sim\,10^{-9}\,\text{to}\sim60\,\text{nW}~\text{m}^{-2}~\text{sr}^{-1}$
- Some (extreme) parameter sets of DS can be excluded
- New data of the EBL density (e.g. JWST, CIBER) will provide further constraints

Thank you for your attention!

Workshop announcement



International workshop on "Cosmic Radiation Fields: Sources in the early Universe"

Date:November 9 - 12, 2010Location:DESY research center, Hamburg, GermanyWebsite:http://www.desy.de/crf2010

- CLOWE, D., BRADAČ, M., GONZALEZ, A. H., MARKEVITCH, M., RANDALL, S. W., JONES, C., & ZARITSKY, D. 2006. A Direct Empirical Proof of the Existence of Dark Matter. *Astrophys. J., Lett.*, **648**(Sept.), L109–L113.
- COLLEY, W. N., TYSON, J. A., & TURNER, E. L. 1996. Unlensing Multiple Arcs in 0024+1654: Reconstruction of the Source Image. *Astrophys. J., Lett.*, **461**(Apr.), L83+.
- FREESE, K., ILIE, C., SPOLYAR, D., VALLURI, M., & BODENHEIMER, P. 2010. Supermassive Dark Stars: Detectable in JWST. Astrophys. J., 716(June), 1397–1407.
- HAUSCHILDT, P. H., & BARON, E. 2006. A 3D radiative transfer framework. I. Non-local operator splitting and continuum scattering problems. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 451(May), 273–284.
- HAUSER, M. G., & DWEK, E. 2001. The Cosmic Infrared Backround: Measurements and Implications. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, **39**, 249.
- IOCCO, F., BRESSAN, A., RIPAMONTI, E., SCHNEIDER, R., FERRARA, A., & MARIGO, P. 2008. Dark matter annihilation effects on the first stars. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **390**(Nov.), 1655–1669.
- KNEISKE, T. M., BRETZ, T., MANNHEIM, K., & HARTMANN, D. H. 2004. Implications of cosmological gamma-ray absorption. II. Modification of gamma-ray spectra. *Astron. Astrophys.*, **413**(Jan.), 807–815.

References II

- MAIO, U., CIARDI, B., DOLAG, K., TORNATORE, L., & KHOCHFAR, S. 2010. The transition from population III to population II-I star formation. *ArXiv e-prints*, Mar.
- MAZIN, D., & RAUE, M. 2007. New limits on the density of the extragalactic background light in the optical to the far infrared from the spectra of all known TeV blazars. *Astron. Astrophys.*, **471**(Aug.), 439–452.
- SPOLYAR, D., FREESE, K., & GONDOLO, P. 2008. Dark Matter and the First Stars: A New Phase of Stellar Evolution. *Physical Review Letters*, **100**(5), 051101-+.
- SPOLYAR, D., BODENHEIMER, P., FREESE, K., & GONDOLO, P. 2009. Dark Stars: A New Look at the First Stars in the Universe. *Astrophys. J.*, **705**(Nov.), 1031–1042.
- TRENTI, M., & STIAVELLI, M. 2009. Formation Rates of Population III Stars and Chemical Enrichment of Halos during the Reionization Era. Astrophys. J., 694(Apr.), 879–892.
- TRENTI, M., STIAVELLI, M., & MICHAEL SHULL, J. 2009. Metal-free Gas Supply at the Edge of Reionization: Late-epoch Population III Star Formation. Astrophys. J., 700(Aug.), 1672–1679.
- TYSON, J. A., KOCHANSKI, G. P., & DELL'ANTONIO, I. P. 1998. Detailed Mass Map of CL 0024+1654 from Strong Lensing. *Astrophys. J., Lett.*, **498**(May), L107+.
- ZACKRISSON, E., SCOTT, P., RYDBERG, C.-E., IOCCO, F., EDVARDSSON, B., ÖSTLIN, G., SIVERTSSON, S., ZITRIN, A., BROADHURST, T., & GONDOLO, P. 2010a. Finding High-redshift Dark Stars with the James Webb Space Telescope. *Astrophys. J.*, **717**(July), 257–267.

ZACKRISSON, E., SCOTT, P., RYDBERG, C.-E., IOCCO, F., SIVERTSSON, S., ÖSTLIN, G., MELLEMA, G., ILIEV, I. T., & SHAPIRO, P. R. 2010b. Observational constraints on supermassive dark stars. *ArXiv e-prints*, June.

Backup slides I



Figure: Comoving halo formation rate for $1-2 \times 10^8$ DM-halos (Zackrisson *et al.* 2010b)

Backup slides II



Figure: Dark Star spectrum calculated withFigure: Dark Star spectrum calculated withPHOENIX vs blackbody withPHOENIX vs blackbody with $T_{DS} = 5000 \text{ K}, M_{DS} = 106 \text{ M}_{\odot}, R_{DS} = 2.4 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$ $T_{DS} = 7500 \text{ K}, M_{DS} = 690 \text{ M}_{\odot}, R_{DS} = 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$

Backup slides III



Figure: Dark Star spectrum calculated withFigure: Dark Star spectrum calculated withPHOENIX vs blackbody withPHOENIX vs blackbody with $T_{DS} = 5000 \text{ K}, M_{DS} = 106 \text{ M}_{\odot}, R_{DS} = 2.4 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$ $T_{DS} = 7500 \text{ K}, M_{DS} = 690 \text{ M}_{\odot}, R_{DS} = 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$

Backup slides IV



Figure: Dark Star spectrum calculated withFigure: Dark Star spectrum calculated withPHOENIX vs blackbody withPHOENIX vs blackbody with $T_{DS} = 5000 \text{ K}, M_{DS} = 106 \text{ M}_{\odot}, R_{DS} = 2.4 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$ $T_{DS} = 7500 \text{ K}, M_{DS} = 690 \text{ M}_{\odot}, R_{DS} = 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}$

Backup slides V



Backup slides VI



Figure: taken from Mazin & Raue (2007), updated regularly

Backup slides VII



Figure: EBL density: PH 5kK vs. PH7.5 kK