

# Minimal self-consistent dark matter phase-space distribution functions confronted to simulations

Thomas Lacroix

Collaborators: M. Boudaud, J. Lavalle, E. Nezri,  
A. Núñez-Castiñeyra, P. Salati, M. Stref

News from the dark 2019

May 20, 2019

!nterTalentum



UAM Universidad Autónoma  
de Madrid



Instituto de  
Física  
Teórica  
UAM-CSIC

# Phase-space distribution of DM & theoretical uncertainties for direct and indirect searches

## Direct searches

$$\frac{dR}{dE} \propto \rho_{\odot} \int_{v_{\min} \leqslant |\vec{v}| \leqslant v_{\text{esc}}} \frac{f_{\odot}(\vec{v})}{|\vec{v}|} d^3v$$

Impact at low masses

$$v_{\min} \sim v_{\text{esc}}$$

## Speed-dependent annihilation

- $\langle \sigma v \rangle(r) \propto \langle v_r^2 \rangle$  **p-wave**  
 $\sigma v = \sigma_1 v_r^2 \Rightarrow \langle \sigma v \rangle \equiv \langle \sigma v \rangle(r)$

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle(r) = \sigma_1 \int d^3v_1 d^3v_2 f_r(\vec{v}_1) f_r(\vec{v}_2) v_r^2$$

- $\langle \sigma v \rangle(r) \propto \langle 1/v_r \rangle$  or  $\langle 1/v_r^2 \rangle$   
**Sommerfeld enhancement**

## Primordial black holes

- Gravitational microlensing event rates (EROS, MACHO)

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dt} \propto \rho(r) \int v f(\vec{v}, \vec{r}) d^3v$$

- Merger rates (gravitational waves)

+ DM substructures (test masses), disruption of stellar binaries

# Standard approaches 1: "Standard halo model"

## Standard halo model (SHM)


Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution

$$f(\vec{v}) = \frac{1}{v_0^3 \pi^{3/2}} e^{-\left(\frac{\vec{v}}{v_0}\right)^2}$$


## Oversimplification

- Isothermal sphere
- Infinite system
- Ad hoc truncation at  $v_{\text{esc}}$


# Standard approaches 2: direct fits to simulations




Ling+ 2010, Mollitor+ 2014



Kelso+ 2016



Bozorgnia+ 2016




Sloane+ 2016

# Standard approaches 2: direct fits to simulations

## General insight

Generic features found in simulations (e.g., cusp/cores)



Bozorgnia+ 2017

## But insufficient approach

- Extrapolations based on fits at 8 kpc
- **Peak speed free parameter**  
⇒ not connected to circular speed
- MW one particular realization
- MW constrained system (e.g., Gaia)
- Subgrid physics

## Self-consistent approach required

- Eddington-like methods: next-to-minimal approach
- Method applied blindly to direct searches so far  
→ Timely to study validity range in detail

# Phase space of dark matter from first principles

## Phase-space distribution $f(\vec{v}, \vec{r})$ : closed system

- Collisionless Boltzmann equation, steady state

$$\{f, H\} = \vec{v} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{r}} - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \vec{r}} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{v}} = 0$$

→ Jeans' theorem:  $f \equiv f(I_1, \dots, I_N)$  where  $\{I_i, H\} = 0$

- Poisson equation

$$\Delta \Phi = 4\pi G \rho \text{ with } \rho = \int f(\vec{v}, \vec{r}) d^3 v$$

## Eddington's inversion formula (Eddington 1916)

Isotropic system + spherical symmetry:  $f(\vec{v}, r) \equiv f(\mathcal{E})$

with  $\mathcal{E} = \Psi(r) - \frac{v^2}{2}$  and  $\Psi(r) = \Phi(R_{\max}) - \Phi(r)$

$$f(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi^2}} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}} \left( \frac{d\rho}{d\Psi} \right)_{\Psi=0} + \int_0^{\mathcal{E}} \frac{d^2 \rho}{d\Psi^2} \frac{d\Psi}{\sqrt{\mathcal{E} - \Psi}} \right]$$

# Phase space of dark matter from first principles

## Phase-space distribution $f(\vec{v}, \vec{r})$ : closed system

- Collisionless Boltzmann equation, steady state

$$\{f, H\} = \vec{v} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{r}} - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \vec{r}} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{v}} = 0$$

→ Jeans' theorem:  $f \equiv f(I_1, \dots, I_N)$  where  $\{I_i, H\} = 0$

- Poisson equation

$$\Delta \Phi = 4\pi G \rho \text{ with } \rho = \int f(\vec{v}, \vec{r}) d^3 v$$

## Eddington's inversion formula (Eddington 1916)

Isotropic system + spherical symmetry:  $f(\vec{v}, r) \equiv f(\mathcal{E})$

with  $\mathcal{E} = \Psi(r) - \frac{v^2}{2}$  and  $\Psi(r) = \Phi(R_{\max}) - \Phi(r)$

$$f(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi^2}} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}} \left( \frac{d\rho}{d\Psi} \right)_{\Psi=0} + \int_0^{\mathcal{E}} \frac{d^2 \rho}{d\Psi^2} \frac{d\Psi}{\sqrt{\mathcal{E} - \Psi}} \right]$$

# Anisotropic extensions

## 1 free parameter

- Constant anisotropy

$$f_{\beta_0}(\mathcal{E}, L) = G(\mathcal{E})L^{-2\beta_0} \quad \text{Cuddeford 1991}$$

- Osipkov-Merritt:  $f(\mathcal{E}, L) = f_{\text{OM}}(Q)$  with  $Q = \mathcal{E} - \frac{L^2}{2r_a^2}$

Osipkov 1979, Merritt 1985

$$\beta(r) = \frac{r^2}{r^2 + r_a^2} \qquad \left[ \beta(r) = 1 - \frac{\sigma_\theta^2 + \sigma_\phi^2}{2\sigma_r^2} \right]$$

## 2 free parameters

$$f(\mathcal{E}, L) = G(Q)L^{-2\beta_0} \quad \text{Cuddeford 1991}$$

## 3 free parameters

- $f(\mathcal{E}, L) = wf_{\text{OM}}(Q) + (1 - w)G(\mathcal{E})L^{-2\beta_0}$  Bozorgnia+ 2013

- $f(\mathcal{E}, L) = F(\mathcal{E}) \left(1 + \frac{L^2}{2L_0^2}\right)^{-\beta_\infty + \beta_0} L^{-2\beta_0}$  Wojtak+ 2008

# Going beyond spherical symmetry

## Inversion for axisymmetric systems

- Based on suitable decomposition of  $f(\mathcal{E}, L_z)$  Hunter & Qian 1993
- Applied to the MW and implications for DM searches  
Petač & Ullio 2018
- See talk by M. Petač

## Angle-action coordinates

- More suitable coordinate system if no spherical symmetry  
Binney & Tremaine 1987
- Best way to account for complexity revealed by Gaia  
e.g. Cole & Binney 2017
- Ansatz for  $f(\vec{v}, \vec{r}) \Rightarrow$  theoretical uncertainties
- Level of refinement not necessarily required for DM searches
- Difficult to apply to a wide variety of objects

# Velocity distribution

Central ingredient for observables

$$f_{\vec{v}}(\vec{v}, r) \equiv \frac{f(\mathcal{E}, L)}{\rho_{\text{DM}}(r)}$$

Speed distribution ( $v = |\vec{v}|$ )

$$f_v(v, r) \equiv v^2 \int d\Omega_v f_{\vec{v}}(\vec{v}, r)$$

Encapsulates most of the dynamical information



For isotropic distribution

$$f_v(v, r) = \frac{4\pi v^2}{\rho_{\text{DM}}(r)} f \left( \Psi(r) - \frac{v^2}{2} \right)$$

# Theoretical consistency and radial boundary



## Imposing a radial boundary

- Finite system ( $R_{\max}$ )  $\Rightarrow$  divergence of  $f(\vec{r}, \vec{v})$  at  $v_{\text{esc}}$  (from  $1/\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}$ )
- Phase-space compression
- $v_{\text{esc}}$  crucial (direct DM searches at low masses, stellar surveys)



# Proper treatment critical for self-consistency



Removing divergence by hand  
⇒ approach no longer self-consistent (Poisson)



Lacroix+ 2018

# Theoretical consistency and radial boundary – prototypical anisotropic case



Even more critical for radially anisotropic system  
(e.g., Osipkov-Merritt model)



# Theoretical consistency and radial boundary

## Regularization

- Modified profile, flat at  $R_{\max}$
- Energy cutoff (King)



Lacroix+ 2018

Not possible for radial anisotropy (e.g., Osipkov-Merritt)

# Theoretical consistency: instabilities


## Validity range of the method

- Standard criterion:  
 $f \geq 0$
  - Antonov instabilities for some DM-baryon configurations
  - Stable solution if  $\frac{df}{d\mathcal{E}} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{d^2\rho}{d\Psi^2} > 0$
- Doremus+ 1971, Kandrup & Sygnet 1985
- Select mass models

Lacroix+ 2018

For anisotropic systems criteria against radial perturbations only

Doremus+ 1973




# Impact on predictions for direct DM searches


Event rate proportional to

$$\eta(v_{\min}) = \int_{v_{\min} \leq v \leq v_{\oplus} + v_{\text{esc}}} \frac{f_{\vec{v}, \oplus}(\vec{v})}{v} d^3v$$

Isotropic




Osipkov-Merritt



# Self-consistent predictions for indirect DM searches

Prototypical case: p-wave annihilation

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle(r) \propto \langle v_r^2 \rangle$$



# Actual predictivity of Eddington's formalism? Tests with cosmological simulations

## Description

- 2 sets of simulations

Mollitor+ 2015

$$M_{\text{DM}} = 2.3 \times 10^5 M_{\odot}, \text{Hsm} = 150 \text{ pc}$$

Núñez+ 2019, in prep.


$$M_{\text{DM}} = 1.9 \times 10^5 M_{\odot}, \text{Hsm} = 35 \text{ pc}$$

- 20 Mpc boxes + zoom-in

- DM-only + hydro

## Procedure

- Fit mass model from simulation  
 $\Rightarrow \rho_{\text{DM}}, \rho_B, \Psi = \Psi_{\text{DM}} + \Psi_B$
- Input for Eddington's method
- Comparison with simulation outputs



Lacroix+ 2019, in prep.

# Actual predictivity of Eddington's formalism? Tests with cosmological simulations

## Comparison of theoretical predictions with simulation outputs

- Speed distribution  $f_v(v, r)$
- Moments of the velocity distribution  $\langle v^n \rangle(r) = \int d^3\vec{v} v^n f_{\vec{v}}(\vec{v}, r)$
- Moments of the relative velocity distribution

$$\langle v_{\text{rel}}^n \rangle(r) = \int d^3\vec{v}_{\text{rel}} F_{\text{rel}}(\vec{v}_{\text{rel}}, r) v_{\text{rel}}^n$$

where

$$F_r(\vec{v}_r, r) = \int d^3\vec{v}_c f_{\vec{v}}(\vec{v}_1, r) f_{\vec{v}}(\vec{v}_2, r)$$


- Full ergodic phase-space distribution  $f(\mathcal{E})$

## Caveat




- Not fits to simulation results
- Simulations only used to test theoretical predictions

# Speed distribution $f_v(v, r)$

$r = 3 \text{ kpc}$





$r = 8 \text{ kpc}$





# Speed distribution $f_v(v, r)$

$r = 20 \text{ kpc}$





$r = 50 \text{ kpc}$





Lacroix+ 2019, in prep.

# Moments of the speed distribution




# Moments of the *relative* speed distribution



# Phase-space distribution - DM only

Reconstruction from 2D bins  $ij$  in phase space ( $r_i, v_j$ )

$$f(\mathcal{E}) = m \frac{d^6N}{d^3x d^3v} \rightarrow f(\mathcal{E})_{ij} = \frac{m}{(4\pi r_i v_j)^2} \frac{N_{ij}}{\Delta r_i \Delta v_j}$$




⇒ consistency check

Lacroix+ 2019, in prep.

# Phase-space distribution - hydro

Reconstruction from 2D bins  $ij$  in phase space ( $r_i, v_j$ )

$$f(\mathcal{E}) = m \frac{d^6N}{d^3x d^3v} \rightarrow f(\mathcal{E})_{ij} = \frac{m}{(4\pi r_i v_j)^2} \frac{N_{ij}}{\Delta r_i \Delta v_j}$$



⇒ consistency check

Lacroix+ 2019, in prep.

# Application: constraints on sub-GeV DM from cosmic positrons - $p$ -wave annihilation


## $p$ -wave annihilation

$$\sigma v = \sigma_1 v_r^2 \Rightarrow \langle \sigma v \rangle \equiv \langle \sigma v \rangle(r)$$

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle(r) = \sigma_1 \int d^3v_1 d^3v_2 f_r(\vec{v}_1) f_r(\vec{v}_2) v_r^2$$

$$\Rightarrow \psi_e \neq \langle \sigma v \rangle \int \rho^2(r) d^3r$$

- Very strong  $e^+$  constraints
- Justifies focusing on Eddington's methods
- Robust w.r.t. uncertainties on anisotropy and propagation



Boudaud+ 2018

# Summary

## Eddington's inversion method

- A few physical assumptions, moderate level of technicalities
- Self-consistent
- Mass model direct input
- Better control astrophysical uncertainties for DM searches
- Readily applicable to variety of objects

## Self-consistency: theoretical validity range


- Radial boundary (direct searches)
- Positive DF + stability

## Actual predictivity?


- Testing the method against cosmological simulations
- Not direct fits!!!
- Eddington method gives a predictivity at  $O(10\%)$   
*Lacroix+ 2019, in prep.*

Thank you for your attention!







Lacroix+ 2018




Lacroix+ 2018




Lacroix+ 2018



Boudaud+ 2018



Boudaud+ 2018



Boudaud+ 2018