



Corrigendum: ‘Anomalous Kolar events revisited: Dark matter?’

M V N MURTHY^{1,*} and G RAJASEKARAN^{1,2}

¹The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, CIT Campus, Taramani P.O., Chennai 600 113, India

²Chennai Mathematical Institute, Siruseri 603 103, India

*Corresponding author. E-mail: murthy@imsc.res.in

MS received 7 July 2016; revised 13 September 2016; accepted 5 October 2016; published online 8 March 2017

Abstract. Some unusual and unexplained events (the so-called Kolar events) were interpreted in *Pramana – J. Phys.* **82**, 609 (2014). This article is a corrigendum to it.

Keywords. Dark matter; Kolar events.

PACS Nos 95.35.+d; 13.15.+g

A couple of years ago a paper was published [1], interpreting some unusual and unexplained events (the so-called Kolar events) observed in the KGF underground laboratory. These events were observed in two phases over two decades starting from 1964.

In [1], these unusual Kolar events were explained as due to the possible decay of unstable dark matter, whose mass may be around 5–10 GeV, with a lifetime of around 10 billion years. This is about the same order of magnitude as the age of the Universe. This tantalizing explanation would have then solved two problems in one stroke, namely the explanation of the Kolar events as well as the observation of dark matter particles in laboratory conditions.

In the meantime, the authors have become aware of some limits on the lifetime of decaying dark matter due to the data from Fermi LAT observations of the extragalactic γ -ray background and Galactic halo. Based on the fact that no unambiguous signal has been found in γ -ray observations, an estimate of the lower bound on the lifetime has been made in the range of 2×10^{25} s or 6×10^{17} years for a mass range of 10–10000 GeV [2]. Fermi LAT observations on dwarf spheroidal galaxies give even tighter bounds [3]. These indirect astrophysical

bounds appear much too high for the Kolar events to be interpreted as due to the decay of dark matter through conventional channels as shown in the above paper. Hence, the explanation is untenable at present unless a way out of this conundrum is found.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank Ernest Ma for bringing these facts to their attention.

There have also been two earlier references (ref. [4]) which gave lower bounds on the lifetime of dark matter, albeit weaker than the above. The authors thank the referee of this Corrigendum for pointing these out.

References

- [1] M V N Murthy and G Rajasekaran, *Pramana – J. Phys.* **82**, 609 (2014)
- [2] Alejandro Ibarra, David Tran and Christoph Weniger, arXiv:1307.6434v2[hep-ph] and other references therein
- [3] Mathew G Baring *et al*, arXiv: 1510.000389[hep-ph]
- [4] R Barbieri and V Berezinsky, *Phys. Lett. B* **205**, 559 (1988)
J Ellis, G B Gelmini, J L Lopez, D V Nanopoulos and S Sarkar, *Nucl. Phys. B* **373**, 399 (1992)