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## Overview

## Stealth dark matter

Attractive and viable composite dark matter model
Exploring gravitational waves from first-order transition


Stealth dark matter motivational review

4-flavor SU(4) lattice phase diagram

Gravitational wave prospects

## Dark matter

## Consistent gravitational evidence from kiloparsec to Gpc scales

$\frac{\Omega_{\text {dark }}}{\Omega_{\text {ordinary }}} \approx 5 \ldots$ not $10^{5}$ or $10^{-5}$
$\longrightarrow$ non-gravitational interactions with standard model

## Composite dark matter



## Early universe <br> Deconfined charged fermions $\longrightarrow$ non-gravitational interactions

## Present day <br> Confined neutral 'dark baryons’ $\longrightarrow$ no experimental detections

## Stealth dark matter

SU(4) dark sector with four moderately heavy fundamental fermions
Lightest scalar 'baryon' is stable dark matter candidate
Direct detection
Symmetries
$\longrightarrow$ electric polarizability is leading interaction

Collider searches
Charged 'meson' Drell-Yan rules out shaded region


## Gravitational waves



## Gravitational waves

First-order confinement transition $\longrightarrow$ stochastic background

$$
\Longrightarrow \text { Lattice studies of stealth dark matter phase transition }
$$

## Phase diagram expectations

Pure-gauge transition is first order Becomes stronger as $N$ increases

First-order transition persists for sufficiently heavy fermions

## How heavy is sufficient for $\operatorname{SU}(4)$ ?



Using $N_{F}=4$ unrooted staggered fermions gauge action with both fundamental \& adjoint plaquette terms

## The lattice phase diagram game

Fermion masses $m=0.05,0.067,0.1,0.2$ (and pure gauge)

$$
\times
$$

Temporal extents $N_{T}=4,6,8,12$

Aspect ratios $L / N_{T}=2,3,4,6,8$


Scan coupling $\beta_{F}$ to sweep temperatures high $\longrightarrow$ low and low $\longrightarrow$ high
= 985 ensembles and counting
[5,000-50,000 MD time units per ensemble]
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## Pure gauge checks: Bulk and thermal transitions



Try to avoid bulk transition for small $N_{T} \longrightarrow$ use $\beta_{A}=-\beta_{F} / 4$
Still need $N_{T}>4$ for clear separation between bulk \& thermal transitions
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Try to avoid bulk transition for small $N_{T} \longrightarrow$ use $\beta_{A}=-\beta_{F} / 4$
Still need $N_{T}>4$ for clear separation between bulk \& thermal transitions

## Pure gauge checks: Order of thermal transition




## Two peaks in Polyakov loop magnitude histogram $\longrightarrow$ first-order transition $\checkmark$

Hysteresis not clearly visible even in pure-gauge case

## Dynamical results: Still looks first order



Pure-gauge \& dynamical susceptibilities show same behavior
$\longrightarrow$ evidence for first-order transition with $m \geq 0.1$
Fundamental fermions explicitly break $Z_{N} \longrightarrow$ don't see two peaks in histograms

What does $m \geq 0.1$ mean?

## How heavy is sufficient for $\operatorname{SU}(4)$ ?

Spectrum measurements
Zero-temp. $24^{3} \times 48$ ensembles

around each transition
$\longrightarrow M_{P} / M_{V}=0.80(3)$ for $m=0.1$
$M_{P} / M_{V}=0.91(1)$ for $m=0.2$


Previous work considered $0.55 \leq M_{P} / M_{V} \leq 0.77 \longrightarrow$ now adding $m=0.05$

From first-order transition to gravitational wave signal
First-order transition $\longrightarrow$ gravitational wave background will be produced How do we predict its features?

Four key parameters
Transition temperature $T_{*} \lesssim T_{c}$
Vacuum energy fraction from latent heat
Bubble nucleation rate (transition duration)
Bubble wall speed


## Next step: Latent heat $\Delta \epsilon$

First-order transition $\longrightarrow$ gravitational wave background will be produced How do we predict its features?

> Vacuum energy fraction $$
\alpha \approx \frac{30}{4 N\left(N^{2}-1\right)} \frac{\Delta \epsilon}{\pi^{2} T_{*}^{4}}
$$

Latent heat $\Delta \epsilon$
is change in energy density at transition


## Recapitulation and outlook

## Stealth dark matter

Attractive and viable composite dark matter model

## Exploring gravitational waves from first-order transition

Gravitational wave observatories will add to constraints from collider searches and direct detection experiments

SU(4) confinement transition appears first order

$$
\text { for } M_{P} / M_{V} \gtrsim 0.8 \text {, smaller masses underway }
$$

Next steps are latent heat, etc., for signal prediction
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## Backup: Thermal freeze-out for relic density



Requires non-gravitational
DM-SM interactions
$\mathrm{DM} \longleftrightarrow \mathrm{SM}$ for $T \gtrsim M_{D M}$
$\mathrm{DM} \longrightarrow \mathrm{SM}$ for $T \lesssim M_{D M}$ $\Longrightarrow$ rapid depletion of $\Omega_{D M}$

Hubble expansion
$\Longrightarrow$ dilution $\longrightarrow$ freeze-out

$2 \rightarrow 2$ scattering relates coupling and mass, $200 \alpha \sim \frac{M_{D M}}{100 \mathrm{GeV}}$
Strong $\alpha \sim 16 \longrightarrow$ 'natural' $M_{D M} \sim 300 \mathrm{TeV}$
(smaller for $2 \rightarrow n$ scattering)

## Backup: Two roads to natural asymmetric dark matter

## Relate dark matter relic density to baryon asymmetry

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{D} & \approx 5 \Omega_{B} \\
\Longrightarrow M_{D} n_{D} & \approx 5 M_{B} n_{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

$n_{D} \sim n_{B} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad M_{D} \sim 5 M_{B} \approx 5 \mathrm{GeV}$
High-dim. interactions relate baryon\# and DM\# violation
$M_{D} \gg M_{B} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad n_{B} \gg n_{D} \sim \exp \left[-M_{D} / T_{s}\right] \quad T_{s} \sim 200 \mathrm{GeV}$
EW sphaleron processes above $T_{s}$ distribute asymmetries

Both require non-gravitational interactions with known particles

## Backup: Confirming thermal transition

Fix $m \cdot N_{T} \approx 0.8 \longrightarrow$ transition moves to $\beta_{F} \rightarrow \infty$ as $N_{T} \rightarrow \infty \checkmark$


