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Motivation – the DAMA controversy

Have we detected dark matter yet? DAMA says yes, others say no.
Motivation – the DAMA controversy

Have we detected dark matter yet? DAMA says yes, others say no.
Motivation – Quenching in NaI(Tl)

If DAMA is seeing dark matter, what can we say about dark matter? DAMA signal region: (2, 6) keV$_{ee}$, what is the nuclear recoil energy?

DAMA reported scintillation quenching factors of 0.3 and 0.09 for Na and I respectively ($^{252}$Cf calibration, spectral fit).

Conflicting results from other energy-dependent measurement in the DAMA energy region of interest.
Experimental setup

Goal: \( \sim 5\% \) measurement 5-50 keV\(_{nr}\) Na recoils

Reliable Na nuclear recoil calibration for NaI(Tl) experiments

Features:

- Low energy neutrons
- Pulsed beam, neutron tagging (double-TOF methods)
- Small NaI(Tl) crystal (low multiple scattering)
- High light yield
- Low energy threshold
- PSD methods
- Multiple angles measured at the same time
Event selection – Time of flight

**TOF1**: time of flight from LiF to NaI(Tl)

**TOF2**: time of flight from LiF to liquid scintillator (LS) neutron detectors

Vertical bands:
- LiF gammas
- LiF neutrons
  (in NaI(Tl))

Horizontal band:
- LiF gammas
  (in LS detectors)

Box (blue):
- Neutron induced nuclear recoils!
Energy calibration (in-run)

Neutron inelastic scattering on $^{127}$I (57.6keV gamma)

Provide in-run energy calibration

Monitor and correct light yield

• Advantages:
  • In-run calibration
  • Uniform distribution in NaI(Tl)
  • Sharp peak
Neutron scattering simulation

Simulation package: Geant4.9.6.p3 (custom-built user interface)
80 processors x 300 hours = >10 billion neutron events (<4 degrees)

Hits recorded in NaI(Tl):
1. Na recoils
2. I recoils
3. Neutrons below production threshold
4. Gamma/e (inelastic)
5. Mixture of above

Single Na recoils dominate the signal region!
Quenching factor evaluation

Fit observed Na recoil spectra to simulation around the peak region. Uncertainties will be discussed in details later.
Na quenching results
Implications of new Na quenching results

Light WIMP fit is disfavored.\[\chi_{\text{min}}/\text{N.D.F.} = 38/18, \ P < 0.01\]

DAMA/LIBRA signal is not compatible with the standard WIMP picture.

Best fit at high mass WIMP predicts a total rate higher than observed.

KIMS ruled out the DAMA/LIBRA heavy WIMP model-independently using CsI crystals.
Technical Discussions
Uncertainties in the measurement

1. Statistic uncertainties: event rate

2. Systematic uncertainties

- Choice of proton/neutron energy
- Protons energy loss in LiF
- Li(p,n)Be neutrons have angular & energy spreads
- Gamma backgrounds from LiF target
- NaI(Tl) and nDets have finite sizes
- Scattering angle has spreads
- Multiple scattering exists: Na, I, Na+Na, Na+I…
- Background event contaminations
Beam-related Uncertainties

**Beam facility:** Tandem accelerator at the Notre Dame University

**Statistical uncertainty:**

- Pulse intensity: $\sim 60,000$ protons/pulse (20nA)
- Proton energy chosen: 2.44 MeV ($\sigma_{p-n}$ & $\sigma_{n-Na}$)
- LiF target thickness: 0.52 mg/cm$^2$

**Systematic uncertainties:**

- Neutron energy spread (from LiF thickness): $\sim 700\pm 35$ keV
- Gamma background: Tantalum backing to absorb proton with low gamma production
- Pulse width: $\sim 2$ns (TOF uncertainty)
- Pulse period: $101.5 \times N$ ns ($N=6, 8$) reduce pileups
Proton energy loss in LiF

Protons lose up to ~70 keV energy in LiF before Li(p,n)Be

Neutron energy: 700 +/- 35 keV

Simulation agrees with NIST pstar data
“Pure neutron scattering”? 

Not only neutrons! 
1. $^7$Li excitation (478keV) 
2. $^{19}$F excitation (197keV, 89 ns half life) 
3. $^{23}$Na excitation (440keV) 
4. $^{127}$I excitation (203keV) 
5. $^{127}$I excitation (58keV) 
6. $^{23}$Na recoils 

Continuous gamma background not labelled.
Detector-related uncertainties

Large NaI(Tl) crystals give high event rate but high uncertainty.

Uncertainty mitigations:
- 1” NaI(Tl) crystal
- 3” high Q.E. PMT
- High reflectivity reflectors
- Thin wall enclosure
- hollow supporting structure
Detector Layout uncertainties

Keep angular uncertainty at <5% while allowing high rate and TOF

- LiF – NaI(Tl) distance: 0.5m (1\textsuperscript{st} run), 0.91m (2\textsuperscript{nd} run)
- NaI(Tl) – nDet distance: ~0.5m (2” nDet) up to 2m (5” nDet)
Summary of Uncertainties

Uncertainties included in the final analysis:

1. Directly from spectral fit:
   \(\sim 1-3\%\)

2. Varying spectral fit ranges:
   \(<3\%\)

3. Light yield calibration:
   \(\sim 1.5\% \ (57.6 \text{ keV } \gamma)\)

4. Detector position:
   determined by kinematics, 3-12\%

Overall uncertainty for Na recoil \(> 10 \text{ keVr}\): \(\sim 5\%\) as expected
What we did right – Rate calculation

Factors to consider in the event rate calculation:

1. Proton beam luminosity, and pulse selector condition
2. Li(p,n)Be yield, LiF thickness
3. Li(p,n)Be neutron angular distribution
4. n – $^{23}$Na scattering cross section
5. n – $^{23}$Na scattering kinematics
6. LS detector neutron detection efficiency
7. Trigger/cut efficiencies

Our calculation was within a factor of 3 compared to observation!

We also managed to make the ~5% uncertainty measurement with 2 days of beam – a good compromise between rate and uncertainty.
What we did right – PSD in NDs

Low energy recoil spectrum suffers from noise.
LS neutron detectors have good pulse shape discrimination capability!
What we did right – Trigger efficiency

Low energy events may not trigger the DAQ (~1.5 p.e. threshold)
Method: to record NaI(Tl) pulses of variable heights together with the corresponding discriminator output.
What can be better – Trigger Threshold

Trigger threshold was limited by 1) low PMT gain (10 stage PMT chosen for high Q.E.) and 2) discriminator capability.

With a lower threshold, we may have observed 1) lower energy Na recoils, and 2) elastic I recoils (~5x lower recoil energy).
What can be better – Detector positions

Largest uncertainty in the measurement comes from

1. Uncertainties in the detector positions
2. Spread of scattering angle for small-angle scattering events
Conclusion

- Neutron scattering spectrometry is a powerful tool to calibrate detector response to nuclear recoils
- Neutron TOF is powerful in rejecting backgrounds
- Pulsed neutron facility can provide additional TOF
- Pulse shape analysis can select clean neutron events
- Multiple scattering needs to be suppressed as much as possible
- Monte Carlo simulations can be used to refine the kinematics

For more information, refer to:
Xu et al, Phys. Rev. C 92, 015807
http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.92.015807
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Controversy about DAMA/LIBRA

Assumptions in standard WIMP sensitivity calculation:

• “Standard WIMP halo”
  • Local WIMP density \( \sim 0.3 \text{ GeV/cm}^3 \) (perfect halo)
  • Only 1 WIMP species
  • Maxwellian velocity distribution (WIMPs in thermal equilibrium)
  • Galactic velocity (\( v_0 \sim 220 \text{ km/s}, \ v_{esc} \sim 600\text{km/s} \))
  • …

• “Standard WIMP-nucleon interaction”
  • Equal cross section to protons and neutrons
  • May or may not have spin-exchange
  • Coherent scattering (nuclear form factor)
  • …

Which of these assumptions are known? NONE!
Model-independent test of DAMA/LIBRA is necessary.
Beam neutron generation

Database: Burke 1974 paper
1. Randomly sample proton energy and angle
2. Randomly generate out-coming neutron angle
3. Calculate neutron energy
4. Weigh this neutron with the Li(p,n)Be cross section

Neutron energy has a similar ~70keV spread
Only simulate <4° neutrons (verified with simulations)
Electronics and DAQ

**Trigger:** NaI(Tl) && (Σ nDet)
Coincidence window: 400 ns, to include maximum TOF
Trigger threshold:
~1.5 photoelectron

**Digitizer:** CAEN V1720E,
250MS/s, 12 bit, loop buffer

**DAQ window:** (-2, 6) µs

**DAQ software:** custom built

**Online analysis:**
TOF spectra
Energy spectra of coincidence events
Waveform example

What is the nuclear recoil energy if it were dark matter interactions?

Assumptions in standard WIMP sensitivity calculation:

- "Standard WIMP halo"