

Snowmass2021 - Letter of Interest

Calorimetric readout of a superfluid ^4He target mass

Thematic Areas:

(IF1) Quantum Sensors

(IF8) Noble Elements

(CF1) Dark Matter: Particle-like

Contact Information:

Scott Hertel (U. Massachusetts) [shertel@umass.edu]

(with the TESSERACT Collaboration)

Authors:

C. Chang (ANL), S. Derenzo (LBNL), Y. Efremenko (ANL), W. Guo (Florida State University), S. Hertel (University of Massachusetts), M. Garcia-Sciveres, R. Mahapatra (Texas A&M University), D. N. McKinsey (LBNL and UC Berkeley), B. Penning (University of Michigan), M. Pyle (LBNL and UC Berkeley), P. Sorensen (LBNL), A. Suzuki (LBNL), G. Wang (ANL), K. Zurek (Caltech)

Abstract:

This letter describes an upcoming detector technology in which low-temperature ($\sim 10\text{mK}$) calorimetry is paired with a superfluid ^4He target mass. At low energies ($< 20\text{ eV}$) the energy of a particle recoil is entirely converted into phonon-like quasiparticle excitations of the superfluid medium, which can readily be sensed. This technology would be sensitive to nuclear recoils of galactic dark matter (DM) down to DM masses of order 1 MeV , and sensitive to lower DM masses via direct excitation of quasiparticles (bypassing the nuclear recoil). The calorimetry development is general to many possible targets and uses and is discussed elsewhere; in this letter we describe those aspects of this technology that are specific to the ^4He target response.

Introduction: Despite technological progress in recent decades, the particle nature of dark matter (DM) remains unknown. Direct detection searches have largely been confined to DM masses greater than ~ 2 GeV (the Lee-Weinberg bound [1]), motivated by an assumption that DM interacts through some extended version of the weak force. However, if new low-mass mediators are hypothesized, then a keV-to-GeV ('light DM') window is newly interesting. Light DM models include freeze-out DM [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9], asymmetric DM [10, 11], and freeze-in DM [12]. Direct detection sensitivity in this mass range is aided by the correspondingly high DM number flux, meaning a given cross section can be probed using surprisingly small active target masses and exposure. The dominating experimental challenge is instead the requirement of extremely low energy thresholds at the eV scale and below (while retaining some particle ID ability). Two DOE Basic Research Needs (BRN) reports have recently emphasized this DM window and these thresholds: a dedicated BRN on light DM [13], and a BRN on HEP Instrumentation [14].

The transfer of kinetic energy from the incident DM to the target nucleus is made inefficient in this regime, where the incident DM is lighter than the target nucleus. This has motivated electron-recoil experimental approaches [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 18], however NR approaches are still strongly motivated: 1) NR experimental backgrounds are greatly reduced. 2) Many DM models predict suppressed leptonic interactions, making NR experiments a required element of a broad search.

Superfluid ^4He : Superfluid ^4He has received recent attention as a potential target material for light DM detection [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] due to several key advantages over other candidate target materials. These advantages include:

- A low nuclear mass, enabling comparatively efficient transfer of energy from sub-GeV DM particles.
- Extreme radiopurity, because helium has no long-lived radioisotopes, can be purified using getters, and when condensed induces impurity freeze-out.
- A liquid phase to zero temperature, thereby compatible with mK-scale calorimetry (Transition Edge Sensors [TESs], Metallic Magnetic Calorimeters [MMCs], Kinetic Inductance Detectors [KIDs], etc.).
- Multiple observable and distinguishable signal channels, each detectable via identical calorimetry, and in sum expressing the total recoil energy:
 1. Short-lived singlet atomic excitations, observable as VUV (~ 16 eV) photons [28].
 2. Long-lived triplet atomic excitations, observable directly in molecular form [29] or upon 'quenching' at an interface [30] after ballistic propagation from the recoil site.
 3. Phonon and roton ('quasiparticle', or QP) excitations, observable either directly using immersed calorimetry or as ^4He atoms ejected at the liquid/vacuum interface ('quantum evaporation') [31].
- A large band gap energy of 19.8 eV (the energy needed to excite the ground state to the first excited state), inhibiting all electronic energy depositions (backgrounds) below this energy.
- Significant isolation of the target mass from environmental vibration and phonons, due to the superfluid material's distinct sound velocity (aka acoustic Kapitza resistance).
- Complete isolation of the target mass from vacuum calorimetry. The vacuum gap between target and sensor allows only strongly athermal QP excitations to be communicated (via quantum evaporation).

These numerous attributes enable superfluid ^4He to provide both a low background rate and a robust signal at sub-keV energies, or even sub-eV energies. Some of these attributes have been experimentally demonstrated by the HERON solar neutrino program [32, 28, 33].

Signal Channel 1, Atomic Excitations: The minimum atomic excitation energy, 19.8 eV, divides ^4He response into two distinct energy regimes: **>19.8 eV** The atomic:QP ratio provides robust particle ID, distinguishing electron and nuclear recoils with high fidelity [26]. **<19.8 eV** No electron recoil process is

possible. This regime can be thought of as ‘NR-only’ on the interaction side or ‘QP-only’ on the signal side. While the <19.8 eV window serves as the primary motivation for the ^4He technology, atomic excitations will provide essential information in understanding backgrounds and rejecting higher-energy recoils. The production yield of singlet and triplet excimers down to their production threshold is a high-priority task.

Signal Channel 2, Quasiparticles: Superfluid ^4He QPs are comparable to phonons in a crystal lattice, but are unique in two ways. 1) QPs propagate away from the recoil site entirely ballistically, provided the ^4He is sufficiently cold ($\lesssim 100$ mK) and sufficiently pure isotopically (^3He fraction: $\lesssim 10^{-9}$, easily achieved [34]). 2) For a significant momentum window ($1.10 < p < 4.54$ keV/c), spontaneous $1 \rightarrow n$ downconversion is forbidden due to conservation of energy and momentum [35, 36]. Taken together, the lack of scattering and the lack of decay enable ^4He QPs to preserve more information than phonons in a lattice.

The momentum distribution of QPs escaping a recoil site can be measured, thanks to strongly momentum-dependent QP characteristics including group velocity and quantum evaporation efficiency. The distribution of QP direction leaving the production site is also preserved (and has been demonstrated experimentally to carry recoil orientation information [37]). In superfluid ^4He , the outgoing QPs encode an energy deposition’s position, its track orientation, and through its momentum spectrum its nature as either NR, ER, or some instrumental non-particle background.

QP Sensing via Quantum Evaporation and ^4He Adsorption: A single QP (~ 1 meV) can liberate a single ^4He atom at the liquid/vacuum interface through a process called ‘quantum evaporation’ (threshold: 0.62 meV). This occurs at a significant probability of 10s of percent (per QP arrival at the interface), consistent between both theoretical treatments [38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43] and experimental observations [44, 31]. An energy deposition in the ^4He target is thus expressed as a pulse of evaporated ^4He atoms, and this evaporation pulse can be sensed via large-area calorimetry. The energy received by the calorimeter is dominated not by the kinetic energy of the liberated atoms, but by the atoms’ adsorption energy onto the calorimeter surface (from the van der Waals attractive potential).

The mass reach of the ^4He technology is set by the energy threshold of the evaporation channel, and the key R&D goal of minimizing this threshold can be accomplished by 1) reducing calorimeter threshold, the topic of a separate LOI, 2) boosting QP reflectivity at solid interfaces [45] to increase the fraction of QPs which result in evaporation¹, 3) boosting the adsorption gain per atom at the calorimeter surface by adding a surface treatment of unusually high adsorption energy.²

If the adsorption gain were increased to 43 meV/atom, then a calorimeter of ~ 1 eV threshold could sense the evaporation/adsorption of $(\sim 1 \text{ eV})/(0.043 \text{ eV}) \approx 23$ evaporated atoms. And if the evaporation efficiency were increased to $\sim 50\%$, then a ~ 23 -atom signal would represent ~ 46 QPs each of ~ 1 meV energy, a ~ 46 meV recoil threshold. The adsorption gain has a clear benefit, enabling sensitivity to recoil energies below the calorimeter threshold. A future calorimeter threshold of ~ 50 meV would enable the detection of single evaporated atoms or single ~ 1 meV QPs.

Conclusions: Superfluid ^4He is a unique material, offering an exceptionally low energy threshold with a large and accessible information content per energy deposit. Near-term R&D goals include 1) measurement of atomic excitation yields to their production threshold, 2) improved sensing methods of triplet excimer quenches on surfaces (perhaps conversion to photons), 3) improved isolation of immersed calorimetry or testing of alternative photon sensors, 4) enhanced QP reflectivity at interfaces, and 5) enhanced adsorption gain. Calorimetric readout of ^4He offers a plausible path towards recoil thresholds of the meV scale, and complementarity with electron-recoil and crystal-based detection methods.

¹The evaporation efficiency is currently only $\sim 5\%$ [46].

²A monolayer of fluoro-graphene, for example, could increase this energy per atom from ~ 10 meV to 43 meV [47].

References

- [1] B. Lee and S. Weinberg, “Cosmological Lower Bound on Heavy-Neutrino Masses,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39** no. 4, (1977) 165–168. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.39.165>.
- [2] C. Boehm and P. Fayet, “Scalar dark matter candidates,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B683** (2004) 219–263.
- [3] C. Boehm, P. Fayet, and J. Silk, “Light and heavy dark matter particles,” *Phys.Rev.* **D69** (2004) 101302.
- [4] D. Hooper and K. M. Zurek, “A natural supersymmetric model with MeV dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77** no. 087302, (Apr., 2008) .
- [5] J. L. Feng and J. Kumar, “Dark-matter particles without weak-scale masses or weak interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** no. 231301, (Dec., 2008) .
- [6] K. M. Zurek, “Multi-component dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** no. 115002, (2009) .
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.79.115002>.
- [7] Y. Hochberg *et al.*, “Mechanism for Thermal Relic Dark Matter of Strongly Interacting Massive Particles,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 171301.
- [8] Y. Hochberg *et al.*, “Model for Thermal Relic Dark Matter of Strongly Interacting Massive Particles,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** no. 2, (2015) 021301.
- [9] E. Kuflik, M. Perelstein, N. R.-L. Lorier, and Y.-D. Tsai, “Elastically decoupling dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (Jun, 2016) 221302.
- [10] D. Kaplan, M. Luty, and K. Zurek, “Asymmetric Dark Matter,” *Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 115016.
- [11] A. Falkowski, J. Ruderman, and T. Volansky, “Asymmetric dark matter from leptogenesis,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **2011** no. 5, (2011) . [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05\(2011\)106](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2011)106).
- [12] L. Hall *et al.*, “Freeze-In Production of FIMP Dark Matter,” *JHEP* **03** (2010) 080.
- [13] Department of Energy Office of Science, High Energy Physics (HEP) Division, “Basic research needs for dark matter small projects new initiatives,” tech. rep., Dec, 2018.
https://science.energy.gov/~media/hep/pdf/Reports/Dark_Matter_New_Initiatives_rpt.pdf.
- [14] “Basic research needs study on hep detector research and development,” tech. rep., 2020.
- [15] J. Alexander *et al.*, “Dark Sectors 2016 Workshop: Community Report,” 2016.
[arXiv:1608.08632](https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.08632) [hep-ph].
<https://inspirehep.net/record/1484628/files/arXiv:1608.08632.pdf>.
- [16] Battaglieri *et al.*, “US cosmic visions: New ideas in dark matter 2017:community report,”
[arXiv:1707.04591](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.04591).
- [17] **XENON10 Collaboration** Collaboration, J. Angle *et al.*, “Search for light dark matter in xenon10 data,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (Jul, 2011) 051301.
<https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.051301>.

- [18] R. Agnese *et al.*, “First dark matter constraints from a supercdms single-charge sensitive detector,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (Aug, 2018) 051301.
<https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.051301>.
- [19] R. Essig, T. Volansky, and T.-T. Yu, “New constraints and prospects for sub-gev dark matter scattering off electrons in xenon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (Aug, 2017) 043017.
<https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.043017>.
- [20] **DAMIC Collaboration** Collaboration, A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.*, “First direct-detection constraints on ev-scale hidden-photon dark matter with damic at snolab,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** (Apr, 2017) 141803. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.141803>.
- [21] W. Guo and D. McKinsey, “Concept for a dark matter detector using liquid helium-4,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (Jun, 2013) 115001. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.115001>.
- [22] T. Ito and G. Seidel, “Scintillation of liquid helium for low-energy nuclear recoils,” *Phys. Rev. C* **88** (Aug, 2013) 025805. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevC.88.025805>.
- [23] H. Maris, G. Seidel, and D. Stein *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 181303.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.181303>.
- [24] K. Schutz and K. Zurek, “On the Detectability of Light Dark Matter with Superfluid Helium,” [arXiv:1604.08206](https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.08206) [hep-ph].
- [25] S. Knapen, T. Lin, and K. M. Zurek, “Light dark matter in superfluid helium: Detection with multi-excitation production,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (Mar, 2017) 056019.
<https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.056019>.
- [26] S. A. Hertel, A. Biekert, J. Lin, V. Velan, and D. N. McKinsey, “A Path to the Direct Detection of sub-GeV Dark Matter Using Calorimetric Readout of a Superfluid ^4He Target,” [arXiv:1810.06283](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.06283) [physics.ins-det].
- [27] F. Acanfora, A. Esposito, and A. D. Polosa, “Sub-GeV Dark Matter in Superfluid He-4: an Effective Theory Approach,” [arXiv:1902.02361](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.02361) [hep-ph].
- [28] Y. Huang *et al.*, “Potential for precision measurement of solar neutrino luminosity by {HERON},” *Astroparticle Physics* **30** no. 1, (2008) 1 – 11.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2008.06.003>.
- [29] W. Guo, S. B. Cahn, J. A. Nikkel, W. F. Vinen, and D. N. McKinsey, “Visualization study of counterflow in superfluid ^4He using metastable helium molecules,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (Jul, 2010) 045301. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.045301>.
- [30] F. Carter *et al.*, “Calorimetric observation of single he_2^* excimers in a 100-mk he bath,” *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **186** no. 3, (2017) 183–196.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10909-016-1666-x>.
- [31] A. F. G. Wyatt, “Quantum evaporation of 4he ,” *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **87** (1992) 453 – 472.
- [32] R. E. Lanou, H. J. Maris, and G. M. Seidel, “Detection of solar neutrinos in superfluid helium,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58** no. 2498, (Jun., 1987) 2498–2501.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.58.2498>.

- [33] J. Adams *et al.* *Proc. XXXIst Moriond Conference, Les Arc (France)* (1996) 14–27.
- [34] “Lancaster helium, ltd.” <http://www.lancasterhelium.uk/>.
- [35] H. J. Maris, “Phonon-phonon interactions in liquid helium,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **49** (Apr, 1977) 341–359. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.49.341>.
- [36] V. Narayanamurti and R. C. Dynes, “Roton propagation and phonon-roton scattering in he ii,” *Phys. Rev. B* **13** (Apr, 1976) 2898–2909. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.13.2898>.
- [37] S. R. Bandler, S. M. Brouër, C. Enss, R. E. Lanou, H. J. Maris, T. More, F. S. Porter, and G. M. Seidel, “Angular distribution of rotons generated by alpha particles in superfluid helium: A possible tool for low energy particle detection,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (Apr, 1995) 3169–3172. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.3169>.
- [38] P. M. Echenique and J. B. Pendry, “Reflectivity of liquid ^4He surfaces to ^4He atoms,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37** (Aug, 1976) 561–563. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.37.561>.
- [39] D. O. Edwards and P. P. Fatouros, “Theory of atomic scattering at the free surface of liquid ^4He ,” *Phys. Rev. B* **17** (Mar, 1978) 2147–2159. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.17.2147>.
- [40] F. Dalfovo, A. Fracchetti, A. Lastri, L. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, “Quantum evaporation from the free surface of superfluid ^4He ,” *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **104** no. 5, (Sep, 1996) 367–397. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00751863>.
- [41] F. Dalfovo, M. Guilleumas, A. Lastri, L. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, “Quantum evaporation from superfluid helium at normal incidence,” *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **9** no. 24, (1997) L369. <http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/9/i=24/a=004>.
- [42] H. J. Maris, “Quantum evaporation from quantum liquids and solids,” *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **87** no. 5, (Jun, 1992) 773–792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00118334>.
- [43] M. B. Sobnack, J. C. Inkson, and J. C. H. Fung, “Quasiparticle scattering at helium surfaces: A microscopic theory,” *Phys. Rev. B* **60** (Aug, 1999) 3465–3475. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.60.3465>.
- [44] C. Enss, S. Bandler, R. Lanou, H. Maris, T. More, F. Porter, and G. Seidel, “Quantum evaporation of ^4He : Angular dependence and efficiency,” *Physica B: Condensed Matter* **194-196** (1994) 515 – 516. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0921452694905878>.
- [45] I. N. Adamenko and I. M. Fuks, “Roughness and thermal resistance of the boundary between a solid and liquid helium,” *Sov. Phys. JETP* **32** (1971) 1123–1129.
- [46] S. R. Bandler, *Detection of Charged Particles in Superfluid Helium*. PhD thesis, Brown University, 12, 1994.
- [47] L. Reatto *et al.*, “Novel substrates for helium adsorption: Graphane and graphene—fluoride,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **400** no. 1, (2012) 012010. <http://stacks.iop.org/1742-6596/400/i=1/a=012010>.