# SIMP search with the SABRE veto

Original idea: DM is strongly interacting but light.





## How well can the SABRE veto reconstruct position?

- Simulation study:
- \* 50 & 20 keV electrons.
- \* 4 locations:
- (0.75, 1, 0) m, (0.75, -1, 0) m, (0.75, 0, 0) m, and (0,0,0) m
- \* Applied averaged QE for photons→PE

- NB: this is an old SABRE PMT configuration.
- Used likelihood analysis to assess most probable of the 4 starting locations event-by-event.









#### SIMP Composite DM search with the SABRE veto

(Not as) Big as a Barn: Upper Bounds on Dark Matter-Nucleus Cross Sections <u>https://arxiv.org/pdf/1907.10618.pdf</u>  $\rightarrow$  point-like DM undergoing contact interactions can't have cross-sections > geometric nuclear size.

But, composite DM (with a finite geometric extent) can have large cross-sections.



### Composite DM search with the SABRE veto



#### Composite DM search with the SABRE veto



# Composite DM search with the SABRE veto

#### Questions:

- Would an underground search (concurrent with SABRE) be possible?
  - What would we need to modify?
    - Trigger?
    - Calibration method?
- How feasible would it be for other detectors to carve out this parameter space?
  - Above-ground segmented LS  $\rightarrow$  PROSPECT
  - Surface runs of other DM detectors?
  - Very large detectors with a decent threshold like Borexino?
- How does directionality change these limits?
- Does the daily modulation from being in the lee of the DM wind help?
- Alternatively, does the lowered flux by attenuation in the Earth hurt?
- How interesting is composite DM generally?