

# Transport of Spin and Mass at Normal-Superfluid Interfaces in the Unitary Fermi Gas

Ding Zhang and Ariel T. Sommer

*Department of Physics, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015, USA*

Transport in strongly interacting Fermi gases provides a window into the non-equilibrium behavior of strongly correlated fermions. In particular, the interface between a strongly polarized normal gas and a weakly polarized superfluid at finite temperature presents a model for understanding transport at normal-superfluid and normal-superconductor interfaces. An excess of polarization in the normal phase or a deficit of polarization in the superfluid brings the system out of equilibrium, leading to transport currents across the interface. We implement a phenomenological mean-field model of the unitary Fermi gas, and investigate the transport of mass and spin across the interface under non-equilibrium conditions. We calculate the spin current and show how it can be understood in terms of the threshold for creating excitations in the superfluid. We find that a large net (mass) current acts to dilute excess polarization in the normal region, and show that the net current results primarily from reverse Andreev reflection.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Experiments on quantum gases of atoms enable strong tests of many-body theories. In particular, studies of ultracold Fermi gases have provided insight into the thermodynamics, excitation spectra, and bulk transport properties of strongly interacting fermions [1–12]. Measurements of fermion transport through mesoscopic channels and quantum point contacts [13–18] and Josephson junctions [19, 20] have extended atomic Fermi gas experiments into the domain of heterogeneous devices. Such “atomtronic” experiments shed light on transport processes relevant to technological device applications. Strongly correlated electron materials such as high-temperature superconductors have gained growing interest for application in devices such as Josephson junctions [21, 22] and spin valves [23, 24]. Experiments on cold atom-based systems that emulate such devices can provide valuable insight into the effects of strong correlations on transport.

Studies of spin-imbalanced Fermi gases reveal a tendency toward phase separation into a weakly polarized superfluid and a highly polarized normal region [1, 3, 25–28]. Spin-imbalanced Fermi gases therefore naturally form a normal-superfluid interface akin to the ferromagnet-superconductor interfaces employed in superconducting spin valves [29–31]. Transport at the N-SF interface has received attention as an important process in the equilibration of spin-polarized Fermi gases [10, 15, 32–35]. In this work, we investigate the transport of spin and mass across the N-SF interface in spin-imbalanced Fermi gases at unitarity. We obtain quantitative predictions based on an effective mean-field model, with parameters determined by experimental thermodynamic [3–5, 36] and spectroscopic measurements [7, 8]. Comparison between our predictions and future experimental results will provide a probe of correlation effects beyond the mean-field level.

We employ the mean-field Blonder-Tinkham-Klapwijk (BTK) approach [37] originally introduced to describe normal-superconductor interfaces, and extended to polarized Fermi gases [32–34]. As in Ref. [34], we employ the superfluid gap and pressure consistent with experiments on the unitary Fermi gas for greater accuracy over a self-consistent

mean-field treatment. In addition, we determine the Hartree energies by matching to experimental equation of state measurements [3, 5] and we account for the polaron effective mass in the normal phase [3, 26, 38–41].

In our analysis, we consider a unitary Fermi gas of homogeneous density [42] separated into a polarized normal region on the left and a superfluid region on the right, illustrated schematically in Fig. 1. The two regions are assumed to be at the same temperature and pressure, but at different chemical potentials. Experimentally, such a system can be prepared by employing a light sheet barrier [12], to initially divide two regions of different spin polarization. The barrier can then be ramped down to allow the system to equilibrate through transport. We employ our mean-field model to calculate the instantaneous spin and mass currents through the interface. In Section II we introduce our mean-field model, and in Section III we outline the calculation of the transport currents. In Section IV we present and discuss our results and we conclude in Section V.

## II. THEORETICAL MODEL

### A. Hamiltonian and its solutions

We employ a model Hamiltonian based on mean-field Hartree-Fock Bogoliubov-de-Gennes (HFBdG) theory [33]:

$$H = \sum_{\sigma} \int d^3r \hat{\psi}_{\sigma}^{\dagger} H_{\sigma}^{(0)} \hat{\psi}_{\sigma} + \int d^3r \left[ \Delta(z) \hat{\psi}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{\psi}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} + \Delta^*(z) \hat{\psi}_{\downarrow} \hat{\psi}_{\uparrow} \right] \quad (1)$$

Here  $H_{\sigma}^{(0)}$  is the single-particle grand canonical Hamiltonian for spin  $\sigma$ :

$$H_{\sigma}^{(0)}(z) = -\frac{\hbar^2 \nabla^2}{2m_{\sigma}(z)} - \mu_{\sigma}(z) + U_{\sigma}(z) \quad (2)$$

The chemical potentials  $\mu_{\sigma}$ , the Hartree energies  $U_{\sigma}$ , and the gap  $\Delta$  are modeled as step functions that are discontinuous




FIG. 1. Schematic of the evolution of a non-equilibrium polarized normal-superfluid interface. Blue: majority (spin up), yellow: minority (spin down); shaded ovals represent Cooper pairs.

across the interface. We label the majority spin state as spin up, and the minority as spin down. The effective masses are modeled as

$$m_{\uparrow} = m_{\downarrow}(z > 0) = m \quad \text{and} \quad m_{\downarrow}(z < 0) = m^* \quad (3)$$

where  $m$  is the bare mass and  $m^*$  in the polaron effective mass. The chemical potentials are

$$\mu_{\sigma}(z < 0) = \mu_{L\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\sigma}(z > 0) = \mu_{R\sigma} \quad (4)$$

the Hartree energies are

$$U_{\sigma}(z < 0) = U_{L\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad U_{\sigma}(z > 0) = U_{R\sigma} \quad (5)$$

We apply the Bogoliubov transformation to the field operators:

$$\hat{\psi}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}) = \sum_n u_{n\uparrow}(\vec{r}) \hat{\gamma}_{n\alpha} - v_{n\uparrow}^*(\vec{r}) \hat{\gamma}_{n\beta}^{\dagger} \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}) = \sum_n u_{n\downarrow}(\vec{r}) \hat{\gamma}_{n\beta} + v_{n\downarrow}^*(\vec{r}) \hat{\gamma}_{n\alpha}^{\dagger} \quad (7)$$

$$\{\hat{\gamma}_{n\sigma}, \hat{\gamma}_{n'\sigma'}^{\dagger}\} = \delta_{nn'} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} \quad (8)$$

The Bogoliubov modes satisfy the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) equations [32, 33]:

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_{\uparrow}^{(0)} & \Delta(z) \\ \Delta^*(z) & -H_{\downarrow}^{(0)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{n\uparrow} \\ v_{n\downarrow} \end{pmatrix} = E_{\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} u_{n\uparrow} \\ v_{n\downarrow} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_{\downarrow}^{(0)} & \Delta(z) \\ \Delta^*(z) & -H_{\uparrow}^{(0)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{n\downarrow} \\ v_{n\uparrow} \end{pmatrix} = E_{\beta} \begin{pmatrix} u_{n\downarrow} \\ v_{n\uparrow} \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

These matrix equations diagonalize the Hamiltonian in terms of the quasiparticle operators  $\hat{\gamma}_{n\sigma}$ :

$$H = H_{gs} + \sum_n (E_{n\alpha} \hat{\gamma}_{n\alpha}^{\dagger} \hat{\gamma}_{n\alpha} + E_{n\beta} \hat{\gamma}_{n\beta}^{\dagger} \hat{\gamma}_{n\beta}) \quad (11)$$

For clarity, and to introduce our notation, below we review the solutions to the BdG equations in the presence of spin imbalance [32, 33]. We will refer to the solutions of (9) and (10) as the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  branch, respectively. We denote momentum in the normal-phase by  $k$  and in the superfluid by  $q$ . In the normal phase, the volume-normalized eigenstates on both

branches have the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \\ v_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}}, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}} \quad (12)$$

where  $\Omega$  is the quantization volume. The first solution requires  $\hbar^2 k^2 / (2m_{\sigma}) > \mu_{L\sigma} - U_{L\sigma}$  to give a positive excitation energy, and corresponds to a particle excitation. Likewise, the second solution requires  $\hbar^2 k^2 / (2m_{\sigma}) < \mu_{L\sigma} - U_{L\sigma}$  to give a positive excitation energy, and corresponds to a hole excitation.

For the superfluid, we define the following parameters:

$$U_s = (U_{R\uparrow} + U_{R\downarrow})/2 \quad \mu_s = (\mu_{R\uparrow} + \mu_{R\downarrow})/2 \quad (13)$$

$$U_h = (U_{R\uparrow} - U_{R\downarrow})/2 \quad \mu_h = (\mu_{R\uparrow} - \mu_{R\downarrow})/2 \quad (14)$$

We parameterize the superfluid Hartree energies by their average  $U_s$ , and their imbalance  $U_h$ , and the superfluid chemical potentials by their average  $\mu_s$  and their imbalance  $\mu_h$ , which is also known as the Zeeman field. The superfluid eigenstates on the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  branches are of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{\vec{q}}(\vec{r}) \\ v_{\vec{q}}(\vec{r}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega}} \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix} e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{r}} \quad (15)$$

Here the quasiparticle amplitudes are:

$$u_0 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\xi_s}{E_s} \right)} \quad \text{and} \quad v_0 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\xi_s}{E_s} \right)} \quad (16)$$

with

$$\xi_s = \frac{\hbar q^2}{2m} - \mu_s + U_s \quad \text{and} \quad E_s = \sqrt{(\xi_s)^2 + \Delta^2} \quad (17)$$

Note that  $E_s$  corresponds to the excitation energy of a spin-balanced superfluid. The energy eigenvalues in the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  branch are:

$$E_{\alpha} = E_s - \mu_h + U_h > 0 \quad (18)$$

$$E_{\beta} = E_s + \mu_h - U_h > 0 \quad (19)$$

At a given energy, and on a given branch, there are two types of solutions depending on the magnitude of  $q$ , giving  $\xi_s = \pm \sqrt{E_s^2 - \Delta^2}$ . Positive  $\xi_s$  describe quasiparticles, and negative

$\xi_s$  describe quasiholes. We give the explicit expressions for the dispersion relations in the Appendix.

Treating our Hamiltonian as a phenomenological theory, we solve for the Hartree energies from experimentally determined equations of state. Meanwhile, we treat the gap  $\Delta$  as a constant equal to  $1.27\mu_s$  for all temperatures below  $T_c$  [7, 8, 43].

### B. Polarized normal phase equation of state




FIG. 2. Normal-phase Hartree energies as functions of  $p_L$ , with (a)  $U_{L\uparrow}/\mu_s$  and (b)  $U_{L\downarrow}/\mu_s$ . For both graphs, the dashed line is at  $T = 0.3\mu_s$ , and the solid line is at  $T = 0.15\mu_s$ .

We solve for the Hartree energies on the normal (left) side by equating the atomic densities in the mean-field model to the densities given by the known equation of state at the same temperature and chemical potentials. The equation of state for the polarized normal phase is well-described by the following expression for the pressure [3, 36]:

$$P_N = P_0(\mu_{L\uparrow}) + \left(\frac{m^*}{m}\right)^{3/2} P_0(\mu_{L\downarrow} - A\mu_{L\uparrow}) \quad (20)$$

Here  $P_0(\mu) = k_B T \lambda_{th}^{-3} F_{3/2}(\beta\mu)$  is the pressure in an ideal Fermi gas at chemical potential  $\mu$ , with  $\lambda_{th} = \sqrt{2\pi\hbar^2/(mk_B T)}$  and  $F_{3/2}(x)$  the complete Fermi-Dirac integral. The polaron parameters are  $A = -0.615$  and  $m^*/m = 1.20$  [3, 26, 38–41].

We obtain the majority and minority atomic densities using  $n_\sigma = \partial P / \partial \mu_\sigma$ ,

$$n_{N\uparrow} = n_0(\mu_{L\uparrow}) - A \left(\frac{m^*}{m}\right)^{3/2} n_0(\mu_{L\downarrow} - A\mu_{L\uparrow}) \quad (21)$$

$$n_{N\downarrow} = \left(\frac{m^*}{m}\right)^{3/2} n_0(\mu_{L\downarrow} - A\mu_{L\uparrow}) \quad (22)$$




FIG. 3. Superfluid spin susceptibility as a function of temperature, normalized by the spin susceptibility of an ideal Fermi gas at zero temperature  $\chi_0 = 3n/(2E_F)$ . Our mean-field model (blue solid curve) is compared to an extended T-matrix approximation (red dashed curve) [44].

Where  $n_0(\mu) = \lambda_{th}^{-3} F_{1/2}(\beta\mu)$ . Meanwhile, the mean-field model gives the densities in terms of the Hartree energies as:

$$n_{N\uparrow} = n_0(\mu_{L\uparrow} + U_{L\uparrow}) \quad (23)$$

$$n_{N\downarrow} = n_0(\mu_{L\downarrow} + U_{L\downarrow}) \quad (24)$$

We solve for  $U_{L\uparrow}$  and  $U_{L\downarrow}$  at a given  $T$ ,  $\mu_{L\uparrow}$  and  $\mu_{L\downarrow}$ , by equating (21) to (23), and (22) to (24).

Since experiments measure densities more directly than chemical potentials, we describe the conditions in the normal phase in terms of the polarization,

$$p_L = \frac{n_{L\uparrow} - n_{L\downarrow}}{n_{L\uparrow} + n_{L\downarrow}} \quad (25)$$

Figure 2 shows the resulting Hartree energies in the normal phase versus polarization. The negative signs of  $U_{L\uparrow}$  and  $U_{L\downarrow}$  indicate attractive mean-field interactions between opposite spins, with the minority experiencing a stronger mean-field attraction.

### C. Polarized superfluid equation of state

We now solve for the Hartree energies on the superfluid (right) side. The finite-temperature equation of state of the unitary Fermi gas in the superfluid phase is known at zero spin polarization [3, 5], but currently not at finite spin polarization. However, the spin susceptibility has been predicted as a function of temperature [44–47] and measured at specific temperatures [9, 48, 49]. To model the equation of state based on the known spin-balanced equation of state and the spin susceptibility, we Taylor expand the pressure  $P_{sf}(\mu_s, \mu_h, T)$  in  $\mu_h$  and take the leading orders:

$$P_{sf}(\mu_s, \mu_h, T) \approx P_{sf}(\mu_s, 0, T) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 P_{sf}}{\partial \mu_h^2} \Big|_{\mu_h=0} \mu_h^2 \quad (26)$$




FIG. 4. Polarization as a function of  $\mu_h/\mu_s$  in (a). Superfluid Hartree energies as functions of  $p_L$ , with (b)  $U_s/\mu_s$  and (c)  $U_h/\mu_s$ . In (a), the vertical dashed and solid lines partition the polarization into the normal phase region and the superfluid region. For all graphs, the dashed line is at temperature  $T = 0.3\mu_s$ , and the solid line is at temperature  $T = 0.15\mu_s$ .

The spin-balanced pressure can be written as a dimensionless function times the pressure of a non-interacting Fermi gas,  $P_{sf}(\mu_s, 0, T) = h(\beta\mu_s)P_0(\mu_s, T)$ . We use the experimentally measured values of  $h(\beta\mu_s)$  from Ref. [5]. The first-order term vanishes because the pressure is an even function of  $\mu_h$ . The coefficient of the second-order term equals the spin susceptibility  $\chi_s = \partial(n_\uparrow - n_\downarrow)/\partial(\mu_\uparrow - \mu_\downarrow)$ . The equation of state can then be modeled as:

$$P_{sf} \approx P_{sf}(\mu_s, 0, T) + \chi_s(\mu_s, T)\mu_h^2 \quad (27)$$

For computational convenience, we take the spin susceptibility from the mean field theory, including the Hartree energy  $U_s$ . At temperatures  $T < 0.3\mu_s$ , our mean-field spin susceptibility agrees with predictions from an extended T-matrix approximation [44] to within 15%, shown in Fig. 3. Our mean-field spin susceptibility is:

$$\chi_s(T) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int dq q^2 \beta f(E_s)(1 - f(E_s)) \quad (28)$$

where  $f(E) = 1/(e^{\beta E} + 1)$  and  $\beta = 1/T$ . Note that  $E_s$  depends on  $q$  and on the Hartree energy  $U_s$  as given in Eq. (17).

We obtain the Hartree energies  $U_s$  and  $U_h$  by equating the densities  $n_\sigma = \partial P/\partial\mu_\sigma$  from our model equation of state (27) with the densities from the mean-field theory. The mean-field densities of spin up (down) are:

$$n_{S\uparrow(\downarrow)} = \int \frac{dq q^2}{4\pi^2} \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{\xi_s}{E_s}\right) f(E_{\alpha(\beta)}) + \left(1 - \frac{\xi_s}{E_s}\right) [1 - f(E_{\beta(\alpha)})] \right\} \quad (29)$$

The mean-field densities depend on  $U_s$  and  $U_h$  through  $E_s$ ,  $E_\alpha$ , and  $E_\beta$ . We solve for the Hartree energies numerically by equating the mean-field densities with the densities implied by (27).

To conclude the discussion of the equation of state, we show in Fig. 4(a) the polarization  $p = (n_\uparrow - n_\downarrow)/(n_\uparrow + n_\downarrow)$  as a function of  $\mu_h/\mu_s$ ; the discontinuities in the curves indicate a first order transition from superfluid to normal phase. The two ends indicate the superfluid maximum polarization  $p_{RC}$  and the normal-phase minimum polarization  $p_{LC}$ . The critical chemical imbalance  $\mu_{hc}$  at which the transition occurs will be discussed further in the next section. In Fig. 4(b-c), we show the superfluid Hartree energies,  $U_s$  and  $U_h$  as functions of  $\mu_h$ , normalized by  $\mu_s$ . We note that  $U_s$  depends only weakly on  $\mu_h$ . Based on these results, the superfluid Hartree energies  $U_{R\uparrow}$  and  $U_{R\downarrow}$  are negative, as in the normal phase, with  $|U_{R\downarrow}| > |U_{R\uparrow}|$ . At  $\mu_h = 0$ , our value for  $U_s$  agrees with spectroscopic measurements [7].

#### D. Mechanical equilibrium and the coexistence condition

Now we consider the two phases together. We assume that the system is prepared at a single temperature  $T$ . We first consider the system in mechanical equilibrium but not in chemical equilibrium. Afterwards, we impose chemical equilibrium to obtain the conditions for coexistence of the normal and superfluid phases.

Mechanical equilibrium is set by equating the pressures  $P_L(\mu_{L\uparrow}, \mu_{L\downarrow})$  and  $P_R(\mu_{R\uparrow}, \mu_{R\downarrow})$ , leading to a constraint on the chemical potentials. Before imposing mechanical equilibrium, there are four degrees of freedom: the density of each spin component in each region, or, equivalently, the four chemical potentials:  $\mu_{L\uparrow}, \mu_{L\downarrow}, \mu_{R\uparrow}, \mu_{R\downarrow}$ . We non-dimensionalize all energies by dividing by  $\mu_s$ , giving three dimensionless parameters,  $\mu_{L\uparrow}/\mu_s, \mu_{L\downarrow}/\mu_s, \mu_h/\mu_s$ . In mechanical equilibrium, pressure balance reduces the number of dimensionless degrees of freedom to two. When showing results for the transport currents, we will represent these degrees of freedom using  $\mu_h/\mu_s$  and the normal-side polarization  $p_L$ . The reason for using  $\mu_h$  instead of  $p_R$  to denote superfluid polarization is that the superfluid density ratio has a narrow range, as shown in Fig. 4a. The chemical potential differences across the interface, which drive particle transport, become functions




FIG. 5. Coexistence condition as a function of  $T/\mu_s$ , for (a)  $\mu_{hc}/\mu_s$ , and (b)  $p_{Lc}$  and  $p_{Rc}$ .

of  $p_L$  and  $\mu_h$ . Writing the chemical potential differences as

$$\delta\mu_\uparrow = \mu_{L\uparrow} - \mu_{R\uparrow} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta\mu_\downarrow = \mu_{R\downarrow} - \mu_{L\downarrow} \quad (30)$$

we find that  $\delta\mu_\sigma \geq 0$  in mechanical equilibrium. The dependence of the  $\delta\mu_\sigma$  on  $p_L$  and  $\mu_h$  will be discussed further in Fig. 9.

Chemical equilibrium imposes two more constraints,  $\delta\mu_\sigma = 0$ , reducing the number of dimensionless degrees of freedom to zero. The combination of mechanical and chemical equilibrium defines the full equilibrium condition, and the two phases coexist at the interface. The previous degrees of freedom  $p_L$  and  $\mu_h/\mu_s$  now take on fixed values at a given dimensionless temperature  $T/\mu_s$ . Figure 5 shows the coexistence conditions from our model as a function of temperature, represented by the critical Zeeman field  $\mu_{hc}/\mu_s$  in (a), and by the critical normal-phase and superfluid polarizations,  $p_{Lc}$  and  $p_{Rc}$ , in (b). The vanishing of  $\mu_{hc}$  at  $T = 0.375\mu_s$  indicates the loss of coexistence between the two phases, suggesting that the system has reached the superfluid critical temperature  $T_c$  [1]. A temperature of  $0.375\mu_s$  corresponds to  $0.154T_F$ , which is similar to, but slightly smaller than, the experimentally measured  $T_c$  of  $0.167(13)$  [5]. Meanwhile, for temperatures below  $0.1T_F (= 0.26\mu_s)$  the normal phase polarization at coexistence  $p_{Lc}$  corresponds to a critical density ratio  $x_{Lc}$  in the range of 0.4 to 0.5, which agrees with the range measured in experiments [1, 3, 7, 50].

### III. SCATTERING FORMULATION AND CURRENT DENSITIES

#### A. Scattering states and coefficients

Transport across the normal-superfluid interface can be described in terms of quasiparticle reflection and transmission coefficients [37]. Scattering of quasiparticles at the normal-superfluid interface of a spin-imbalanced Fermi gas has been discussed previously in Refs. [32–34]. We extend previous results by including the Hartree energies and polaron effective mass in the scattering problem. We use the resulting scattering coefficients to calculate the currents of spin up and spin down fermions across the interface.

To describe scattering at the normal-superfluid interface, we employ energy normalization with respect to the  $z$ -component of the momentum, rather than the volume normalization of Section II A. Informally, for a reflected plane wave, our normalization would correspond to:

$$u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{r}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar|v_z|}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \quad (31)$$

where  $v_z$  is the  $z$ -component of the group velocity, given by  $\hbar v_z = \partial E / \partial k_z$ , and  $r$  represents a reflection coefficient. With this normalization,  $|r|^2$  has the correct meaning as a ratio of probability fluxes, rather than a ratio of probability densities. This normalization is helpful when dealing with multiple scattering channels having potentially different group velocities. Moving from the single-region solutions of Section II A to an interface problem also changes the Bogoliubov modes into scattering solutions that obey boundary conditions at the interface. We parameterize the scattering states in terms of their total energy and transverse momentum, which are both conserved, as well as the incident (*in*) channel of the scattering process. The  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  branches each have four channels, corresponding to a particle or hole incident on the interface from the left or right. Note that the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  branches have no cross-coupling due to conservation of spin [29].

We express the total current densities of spin up and spin down in terms of the contributions of each Bogoliubov mode:

$$J_\sigma = \frac{1}{A} \sum_{n, \mathbf{k}_\perp} \int dE (j_{\sigma n\alpha} + j_{\sigma n\beta}) \quad (32)$$

Here  $n$  runs over the four scattering modes,  $\mathbf{k}_\perp$  is the transverse momentum, and  $E$  is the energy. The cross-sectional area  $A$  cancels upon converting the sum on  $\mathbf{k}_\perp$  to an integral. In terms of the energy-normalized mode functions, the spin-up current per unit energy from each mode is given by:

$$j_{\uparrow n\alpha} = \frac{\hbar}{2im} \left( \frac{\partial u_{n\uparrow}}{\partial z} u_{n\uparrow}^* - \frac{\partial u_{n\uparrow}^*}{\partial z} u_{n\uparrow} \right) f_{n\alpha} \quad (33)$$

$$j_{\uparrow n\beta} = -\frac{\hbar}{2im} \left( \frac{\partial v_{n\uparrow}}{\partial z} v_{n\uparrow}^* - \frac{\partial v_{n\uparrow}^*}{\partial z} v_{n\uparrow} \right) (1 - f_{n\beta}) \quad (34)$$

Similarly, the contributions to the spin-down current are:

$$j_{\downarrow n\beta} = \frac{\hbar}{2im^*} \left( \frac{\partial u_{n\downarrow}}{\partial z} u_{n\downarrow}^* - \frac{\partial u_{n\downarrow}^*}{\partial z} u_{n\downarrow} \right) f_{n\beta} \quad (35)$$

$$j_{\downarrow n\alpha} = -\frac{\hbar}{2im^*} \left( \frac{\partial v_{n\downarrow}}{\partial z} v_{n\downarrow}^* - \frac{\partial v_{n\downarrow}^*}{\partial z} v_{n\downarrow} \right) (1 - f_{n\alpha}) \quad (36)$$

Here  $f_{n\alpha}$  and  $f_{n\beta}$  are the occupation probabilities of the Bogoliubov modes in the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  branches, respectively. Note that the occupation probabilities and mode functions implicitly depend on  $E$  and  $\mathbf{k}_\perp$ .

Under non-equilibrium conditions, the left and right regions will have different chemical potentials for a given spin. When solving the scattering problem, we employ the technique introduced in Ref. [37] of referencing all energies to the superfluid-side chemical potentials, and accounting for the non-equilibrium conditions through the quasiparticle distribution functions  $f_n$ .

We now express the Bogoliubov modes in terms of reflection and transmission coefficients. We write the mode functions for the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  branches as

$$\psi_{n\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{n\uparrow} \\ v_{n\downarrow} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{n\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{n\downarrow} \\ v_{n\uparrow} \end{pmatrix} \quad (37)$$

for the four channels  $n \in \{Lp, Lh, Rp, Rh\}$ . For a given branch, we construct scattering states in terms of *in* and *out* states, which we formally assemble into vectors (dropping the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  subscripts):

$$\psi^{in(out)} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{Lp} \\ \psi_{Lh} \\ \psi_{Rp} \\ \psi_{Rh} \end{pmatrix}^{in(out)} \quad (38)$$

The scattering states in each of the four channels are expressed in terms of the *in* and *out* states and the  $S$  matrix:

$$\psi_n = \psi^{in} \cdot \mathbf{e}_n + \psi^{out} \cdot S \mathbf{e}_n \quad (39)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_n$  is the  $n$ -th unit vector, and the  $S$  matrix for either branch consists of 16 scattering coefficients:

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} r_{pp}^A & r_{ph}^B & t_{pp}^C & t_{ph}^D \\ r_{hp}^A & r_{hh}^B & t_{hp}^C & t_{hh}^D \\ r_{pp}^A & r_{ph}^B & r_{pp}^C & r_{ph}^D \\ r_{hp}^A & r_{hh}^B & r_{hp}^C & r_{hh}^D \end{pmatrix} \quad (40)$$

The labels  $A, B, C,$  and  $D$  refer to the four scattering channels  $Lp, Lh, Rp,$  and  $Rh$ , respectively.

For the  $\alpha$  branch, the *in* and *out* states of the two left-side scattering channels are:

$$\psi_{Lp\alpha}^{in(out)} = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi\hbar^2 k_{p\uparrow}}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} e^{\pm i k_{p\uparrow} z} e^{i \mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{r}} \theta(-z) \quad (41)$$

$$\psi_{Lh\alpha}^{in(out)} = \sqrt{\frac{m^*}{2\pi\hbar^2 k_{h\downarrow}}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} e^{\mp i k_{h\downarrow} z} e^{i \mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{r}} \theta(-z) \quad (42)$$

And for the right side:

$$\psi_{Rp\alpha}^{in(out)} = \sqrt{\frac{m E_s / \xi_s}{2\pi\hbar^2 q_{p\alpha}}} \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix} e^{\pm i q_{p\alpha} z} e^{i \mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{r}} \theta(z) \quad (43)$$

$$\psi_{Rh\alpha}^{in(out)} = \sqrt{\frac{m E_s / \xi_s}{2\pi\hbar^2 q_{h\alpha}}} \begin{pmatrix} v_0 \\ u_0 \end{pmatrix} e^{\mp i q_{h\alpha} z} e^{i \mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{r}} \theta(z) \quad (44)$$

Here the upper and lower signs in the exponentials correspond to the *in* and *out* states, respectively, and  $\theta(z)$  is the Heaviside step function. The wavevectors  $k_{p\uparrow}, k_{h\downarrow}, q_{p\alpha},$  and  $q_{h\alpha}$  are the magnitudes of the  $z$  components of the wavevectors of particle and hole excitations on the  $\alpha$  branch in the normal and superfluid phases; their dependence on the energy and transverse momentum is given in Appendix A. Expressions for the  $\beta$  branch *in* and *out* states can be obtained by replacing  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta, \uparrow \leftrightarrow \downarrow$  in (41)-(44) and  $m \leftrightarrow m^*$  in (41) and (42).

The scattering coefficients are obtained by imposing boundary conditions on the scattering states (39). The mode functions must be continuous across the interface:  $\psi_n(z \rightarrow 0^-) = \psi_n(z \rightarrow 0^+)$ . For the  $\alpha$  branch, the derivatives satisfy:

$$\left( \frac{1}{m} \quad 0 \right) \frac{\partial \psi_{n\alpha}}{\partial z} \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0^-} = \left( \frac{1}{m} \quad 0 \right) \frac{\partial \psi_{n\alpha}}{\partial z} \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0^+} \quad (45)$$

For the  $\beta$  branch:

$$\left( \frac{1}{m^*} \quad 0 \right) \frac{\partial \psi_{n\beta}}{\partial z} \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0^-} = \left( \frac{1}{m} \quad 0 \right) \frac{\partial \psi_{n\beta}}{\partial z} \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0^+} \quad (46)$$

Notably, the derivative of the wavefunction is discontinuous across the interface, because of the difference between the polaron mass  $m^*$  and the bare mass  $m$ .

Full expressions for the resulting scattering coefficients are given in Appendix B. We find that the  $S$  matrix is unitary,  $S^\dagger S = 1$ , as required by conservation of probability. We also find that the transpose satisfies  $S(\Delta)^T = S(\Delta^*)$ , as required by time-reversal symmetry. As  $S$  has the property  $S(\Delta)^* = S(\Delta^*)$ , it follows that  $S$  is Hermitian:  $S^\dagger = S$ . The unitarity and Hermiticity of  $S$  will assist in simplifying the expressions for the currents. In particular, the coefficients for channels  $C$  and  $D$  (excitation incident from the right) can be written in terms of the coefficients for channels  $A$  and  $B$  (excitation incident from the left), allowing us to express the currents in terms of the coefficients for channels  $A$  and  $B$ .

Figure 6 illustrates the scattering processes for an excitation incident from the left (normal) side. We distinguish between Andreev current resulting from Andreev reflection (Fig. 6c and d) and normal (non-Andreev) current resulting from transmission (Fig. 6a and b). Andreev current carries spin-up and spin-down fermions in pairs and therefore transfers no net spin. Normal transmission creates an excitation in the superfluid and must occur at energies above the gap in the superfluid excitation spectrum. Andreev reflection, on the other hand, does not create an excitation in the superfluid, and therefore does not face a minimum energy requirement. The Andreev current can be divided into forward and backward Andreev current, illustrated in Fig. 6(c) and (d). A forward




FIG. 6. Physical and BdG picture of scattering processes. Blue: majority (spin up), yellow: minority (spin down); shaded ovals represent Cooper pairs. (a) normal transmission of particle. (b) normal transmission of a hole. (c) forward Andreev reflection. (d) backward Andreev reflection.

Andreev reflection converts a pair of fermions of opposite spin in the normal phase into a Cooper pair in the superfluid. A backward Andreev reflection is the time-reversed process, in which a Cooper pair dissociates into two normal fermions of opposite spin. The later is an important source of current when the normal phase has a high polarization  $p_L$ , which suppresses the forward Andreev reflection. Backward Andreev reflection then acts to reduce the polarization of the normal side toward its equilibrium value.

## B. Current densities

Employing the scattering states in the expressions for the current contributions (33)-(36) gives general expressions for

$$j_\alpha^{\text{net}} = \frac{1}{h} \left\{ (1 - |r_{pp_\alpha}^A|^2 + |r_{hp_\alpha}^A|^2) [f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\uparrow) - f(E_\alpha)] - (1 - |r_{hh_\alpha}^B|^2 + |r_{ph_\alpha}^B|^2) [f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\downarrow) - f(E_\alpha)] \right\} \quad (48)$$

$$j_\alpha^{\text{spin}} = \frac{1}{h} \left\{ (1 - |r_{pp_\alpha}^A|^2 - |r_{hp_\alpha}^A|^2) [f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\uparrow) - f(E_\alpha)] + (1 - |r_{hh_\alpha}^B|^2 - |r_{ph_\alpha}^B|^2) [f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\downarrow) - f(E_\alpha)] \right\} \quad (49)$$

The  $\beta$  branch contributions are:

$$j_\beta^{\text{net}} = \frac{1}{h} \left\{ (1 - |r_{pp_\beta}^A|^2 + |r_{hp_\beta}^A|^2) [f(E_\beta + \delta\mu_\downarrow) - f(E_\beta)] - (1 - |r_{hh_\beta}^B|^2 + |r_{ph_\beta}^B|^2) [f(E_\beta + \delta\mu_\uparrow) - f(E_\beta)] \right\} \quad (50)$$

$$j_\beta^{\text{spin}} = \frac{1}{h} \left\{ (1 - |r_{pp_\beta}^A|^2 - |r_{hp_\beta}^A|^2) [f(E_\beta) - f(E_\beta + \delta\mu_\downarrow)] - (1 - |r_{hh_\beta}^B|^2 - |r_{ph_\beta}^B|^2) [f(E_\beta + \delta\mu_\uparrow) - f(E_\beta)] \right\} \quad (51)$$

In regimes where a scattering channel is closed, the corresponding scattering coefficients drop out of the expressions for the currents. Appendix D describes the regimes in more detail.

The current density integrands (48)-(51) show that the contributions from the  $\beta$  branch are small compared to the  $\alpha$  branch. Since  $E_\alpha$ ,  $E_\beta$ ,  $\delta\mu_\uparrow$  and  $\delta\mu_\downarrow$  are positive, all the Fermi

the currents in terms of the  $S$  matrix elements. In particular, we are interested in the net (mass) current and the spin current:

$$J^{\text{net}} = J_\uparrow + J_\downarrow \quad \text{and} \quad J^{\text{spin}} = J_\uparrow - J_\downarrow \quad (47)$$

Depending on the values of  $E$  and  $k_\perp$ , some scattering channels can become closed, leading to different scattering regimes as described in Refs. [32, 33]. Within intervals of  $E$  and  $k_\perp$  where all the channels are open, the contributions to the net and spin currents from the  $\alpha$  branch are given by:

functions in the  $\beta$  currents have positive arguments, while some in the  $\alpha$  currents can have negative arguments. With positive arguments, the Fermi function quickly drops to zero, leading to vanishing results for the  $\beta$  currents. The  $\beta$  branch was also found to have a small contribution to heat current at the interface in Ref. [32, 33]

The dominance of the  $\alpha$  branch results from the polarization

of the normal phase. Creating a large normal (non-Andreev) current of spin  $\sigma$  in the  $\alpha$  branch requires  $\delta\mu_\sigma \geq E_{\alpha\min}$ , where  $E_{\alpha\min}$  is the minimum of  $E_\alpha$ . As discussed in the next section, this can be achieved sufficiently far from equilibrium. On the other hand, because the  $\beta$  branch consists of spin up holes and spin down particles, a large normal current in the  $\beta$  branch requires  $\delta\mu_\sigma \leq -E_{\alpha\min}$ , which is impossible since  $\delta\mu_\sigma \geq 0$ . In addition, as mentioned earlier, we apply the superfluid chemical potentials  $\mu_{R\sigma}$  to the normal side when solving the scattering problem, and implement non-equilibrium through the quasiparticle distribution functions. Consequently, on the normal side, the density of spin-up particles formally exceeds the density of spin-up holes, and vice versa for spin down, so that the  $\alpha$  branch accounts for the majority of excitations on the normal side. In our final calculations, we confirm that for temperatures below  $0.3\mu_s$ , the  $\alpha$  branch accounts for at least 99% of the current.

#### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION




FIG. 7. Chemical potentials and schematic current densities across the interface. (a)  $p_L = 99\%$ , and  $\mu_h = 0$ . (b)  $p_L = 60\%$ , and  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ . Both figures are at  $T = 0.15\mu_s$ .

In this section, we apply our theory to two different conditions, (1)  $\mu_h = 0$  for a spin-balanced superfluid phase, and (2)  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$  for a maximally polarized superfluid phase. In both cases, we consider a normal region with polarization  $p_L$  greater than the equilibrium value, so that the system is out of global equilibrium. One can think of  $\mu_h = 0$  as an initial condition in which the superfluid is unpolarized before being brought into contact with the normal region, while  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$  can represent either an alternative initial condition, or a typical




FIG. 8. Net, spin, spin-up and spin-down current densities as functions of  $p_L$ , in the conditions of (a)  $\mu_h = 0$ , and (b)  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ . For both graphs,  $T = 0.15\mu_s$ .

steady-state condition that the system soon reaches after the superfluid spin polarization saturates to its maximal value. In both cases, we calculate the instantaneous currents and point out interesting features of the results. Major qualitative points of interest include: (1) the effect of a threshold polarization on the magnitude of the spin current, (2) the importance of Andreev current to the net current, and (3) the breaking of time reversal symmetry between forward and backward Andreev currents away from equilibrium.

We qualitatively illustrate the spin and net current across the interface for two representative conditions in Fig. 7. In (a), the normal-side polarization is  $p_L = 0.99$  and the superfluid is unpolarized ( $\mu_h = 0$ ). In (b), the normal side has a smaller polarization  $p_L = 0.6$ , which still exceeds  $p_{Lc} = 0.40$ , while the superfluid is saturated at  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ . The arrows show the direction and, qualitatively, the magnitude of the currents. In Fig. 7(a), a large net current flows into the normal phase and a spin current with a similar magnitude flows into the superfluid. Since Andreev current carries zero net spin, the large spin current indicates a large normal (non-Andreev) current. Indeed, as shown by the horizontal lines in Fig. 7(a), the chemical potential differences between the left and right side for both spins exceed the minimum energy cost  $E_{\min}(0)$  for creating an excitation in the  $\mu_h = 0$  superfluid, allowing a large normal current to flow. To interpret the chemical potentials shown in Fig. 7, one should bear in mind that the current occurs predominantly due to the  $\alpha$  branch, consisting of spin up particles and spin down holes. Efficient creation of excitations in the superfluid then requires  $\mu_{L\uparrow} > \mu_{R\uparrow} + E_{\min}$  for spin up and  $\mu_{L\downarrow} < \mu_{R\downarrow} - E_{\min}$  for spin down. In Fig. 7(b), a large net current flows into the normal phase while a small spin current flows into the superfluid. The small spin current suggests a






FIG. 9. Spin current, normal-particle current and negative normal-hole current as functions of  $p_L$ , in the conditions of (a)  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ , and (c)  $\mu_h = 0$ .  $\delta\mu_\uparrow/\mu_s$  and  $\delta\mu_\downarrow/\mu_s$  as functions of  $p_L$ , with (b)  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$  and (d)  $\mu_h = 0$ . In (a) and (b), the dashed vertical line represents the threshold polarization for the hole current  $p_h^{th}$ . In (c) and (d), the legend follows those in (a) and (b), respectively; in addition, the solid vertical line represents the threshold polarization for the particle current  $p_p^{th}$ . For all plots,  $T = 0.15\mu_s$ .

small normal current, and indeed, the chemical potential differences in Fig. 7(b) for spin up and spin down are both below the threshold to create excitations in the superfluid. Meanwhile, as we will see, the net current results predominantly from backward Andreev reflection.

We show the spin and net currents quantitatively for all allowed  $p_L$  values in Figs. 8(a) and (b). The current densities




FIG. 10. Net current, normal current, and Andreev current as functions of  $p_L$ , in the conditions of (a)  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ , and (b)  $\mu_h = 0$ . Forward and backward Andreev current as functions of  $p_L$  in (c): the dotted line and the dashed line are at  $\mu_h = 0$ ; the dot-dashed line and the solid line are at  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ ; we put a negative sign before the backward Andreev current to show its magnitude and compare to that of the forward Andreev current. For all plots,  $T = 0.15\mu_s$ .

are normalized by

$$J_0 = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \frac{m}{\hbar^3} \mu_s^2 \quad (52)$$

The spin current in Fig. 8(a), where  $\mu_h = 0$ , becomes relatively large, while the spin current in Fig. 8(b), where  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ , remains small even at large  $p_L$ . This behavior can be understood as a consequence of the chemical potential differences  $\delta\mu_\sigma$  being larger at  $\mu_h = 0$  than at  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ . Figure 9(b) and (d) show the chemical potential differences imposed by mechanical equilibrium, along with the thresholds  $p_p^{th}$  ( $p_h^{th}$ ) at which  $\delta\mu_\uparrow$  ( $\delta\mu_\downarrow$ ) exceed  $E_{\min}$ . In Fig. 9(a) and (c), we show the spin current, particle current and minus the hole current versus  $p_L$  and compare them with the  $\delta\mu_\sigma$  plots. Notably, for  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ ,  $\delta\mu_\uparrow$  never reaches  $E_{\min}$ . Correspondingly, the spin-up current is insignificant, which is shown by the dash-dotted line in Fig. 9(a), and only the hole current is important for the spin current. For  $\mu_h = 0$ , threshold polarizations exist for both the spin-up and spin-down currents, and both contribute

significantly to the spin current.

While the spin current consists entirely of normal current, the net current consists largely of Andreev current. In Fig. 10(a) and Fig. 10(b), we compare the normal and Andreev components of the net current for the two  $\mu_h$  values. In (a), where  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ , the Andreev current accounts for most of the net current for all values of  $p_L$ . In (b), where  $\mu_h = 0$ , the normal current becomes appreciable but is still less significant than the Andreev current.

In Fig. 10(c), we split the Andreev current into forward and backward Andreev currents, and observe the importance of the backward Andreev reflection for the relaxation of the system. The forward and backward Andreev contributions are given by:

$$j_{\alpha,f}^{\text{Andreev}} = \frac{2}{h} |r_{hp_\alpha}^A|^2 f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\uparrow) [1 - f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\downarrow)] \quad (53)$$

$$j_{\alpha,b}^{\text{Andreev}} = -\frac{2}{h} |r_{hp_\alpha}^A|^2 f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\downarrow) [1 - f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\uparrow)] \quad (54)$$

The forward Andreev current vanishes at high normal-phase polarization  $p_L$  because the normal phase has few spin-down atoms for transmission of pairs. Meanwhile, the backward Andreev reflection dominates the Andreev current regardless of  $\mu_h$ . Combining this picture with the predominance of the Andreev current shown in Fig. 10(a) and (b) shows that backward Andreev reflection is the most important process for a system with a highly polarized normal phase.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have set up a mean field theory for calculation of spin and mass transport at non-equilibrium normal-superfluid interfaces in the unitary Fermi gas. We use the experimentally determined equations of state to modify the HF-BdG mean-field theory, and develop a simple model for the superfluid finite temperature equation of state. Subsequently, we obtain the coexistence condition  $\mu_{hc}$  of the NS junction, and show the constraints in chemical potential differences  $\delta\mu_\sigma$  as functions of normal-phase polarization  $p_L$ . Our model gives the instantaneous current across the NS interfaces. In a detailed analysis, we observed the threshold normal-phase polarizations that affect the spin current, and the breaking of time reversal symmetry of forward and backward Andreev current as the system deviates from equilibrium. These calculations provide a benchmark for more detailed theoretical treatments of many-body effects in NS interface transport, and for comparison to future experimental results.

## VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank David Huse and Martin Zwierlein for stimulating discussions, and Yoji Ohashi and Hiroyuki Tajima for sharing their spin susceptibility data.

## Appendix A: Alpha branch dispersion relationships




FIG. 11. Dispersion curve of superfluid excitation energy for both branches at  $T = 0.15\mu_s$  and maximal superfluid polarization  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$ . The solid line represents  $E_\alpha$ , and the dashed line represents  $E_\beta$ . The energy and the wavevector are normalized by  $\mu_s$  and  $k_s$ , respectively, with  $k_s = 2m\mu_s/\hbar^2$  and  $\mu_s$  the average chemical potential (13).

For each excitation energy  $E_\alpha$  value, there can be 4 absolute values of momenta at most. They can be found by the formula below:

$$k_{p\uparrow} = \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\hbar^2}(\mu_{\uparrow S} + U_{\uparrow N} + E_\alpha - \xi_\perp)} \quad (A1)$$

$$k_{h\downarrow} = \sqrt{\frac{2m^*}{\hbar^2}(\mu_{\downarrow S} + U_{\downarrow N} - E_\alpha) - \frac{2m}{\hbar^2}\xi_\perp} \quad (A2)$$

$$q_{p\alpha} = \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\hbar^2}(\mu_S + U_S + \sqrt{(E_\alpha + U_h + \mu_h)^2 - \Delta^2} - \xi_\perp)} \quad (A3)$$

$$q_{h\alpha} = \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\hbar^2}(\mu_S + U_S - \sqrt{(E_\alpha + U_h + \mu_h)^2 - \Delta^2} - \xi_\perp)} \quad (A4)$$

Figure 11 shows the superfluid dispersion relations in  $E_{\alpha(\beta)}$  versus  $q_{\alpha(\beta)}$ , normalized by  $\mu_s$  and  $k_s$  respectively.

## Appendix B: Scattering coefficients

The scattering coefficients necessary for the current determination are:

$$r_{pp_\alpha}^A = \frac{1}{c_0} \left[ u_0^2 (k_{p\uparrow} - q_{p\alpha}) \left( \frac{m}{m^*} k_{h\downarrow} + q_{h\alpha} \right) + v_0^2 \left( q_{p\alpha} - \frac{m}{m^*} k_{h\downarrow} \right) (k_{p\uparrow} + q_{h\alpha}) \right] \quad (B1)$$

$$r_{hp_\alpha}^A = \frac{1}{c_0} 2u_0v_0 \sqrt{\frac{m}{m^*} k_{h\downarrow} k_{p\uparrow}} (q_{h\alpha} + q_{p\alpha}) e^{-ix_0} \quad (B2)$$

$$r_{hh_\alpha}^B = \frac{1}{c_0} \left[ u_0^2 \left( \frac{m}{m^*} k_{h\downarrow} - q_{h\alpha} \right) (q_{p\alpha} + k_{p\uparrow}) + v_0^2 (q_{h\alpha} - k_{p\uparrow}) \left( q_{p\alpha} + \frac{m}{m^*} k_{h\downarrow} \right) \right] \quad (B3)$$




FIG. 12. Spin current  $J^{\text{spin}}/J_0$  as a function of temperature  $T/\mu_s$  at  $p_L = 99\%$ .

where

$$c_0 = u_0^2(k_{p\uparrow} + q_{p\alpha})\left(\frac{m}{m^*}k_{h\downarrow} + q_{h\alpha}\right) + v_0^2\left(q_e - \frac{m}{m^*}k_{h\downarrow}\right)(k_{p\uparrow} - q_{h\alpha}) \quad (\text{B4})$$

and  $X_0$  denotes the phase of the gap  $\Delta$ . Other Case A and Case B coefficients are:

$$t_{pp\alpha}^A = \frac{1}{c_0} 2u_0 \sqrt{q_{p\alpha}k_{p\uparrow}} \left(q_{h\alpha} + \frac{m}{m^*}k_{h\downarrow}\right) \sqrt{\frac{\xi_s}{E_s}} e^{-iX_0/2} \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$t_{hp\alpha}^A = \frac{1}{c_0} 2v_0 \sqrt{k_{p\uparrow}q_{h\alpha}} \left(q_{p\alpha} - \frac{m}{m^*}k_{h\downarrow}\right) \sqrt{\frac{\xi_s}{E_s}} e^{-iX_0/2} \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$t_{ph\alpha}^B = \frac{1}{c_0} 2v_0 \sqrt{\frac{m}{m^*}k_{h\downarrow}q_{e\alpha}} \left(q_{h\alpha} - k_{e\uparrow}\right) \sqrt{\frac{\xi_s}{E_s}} e^{iX_0/2} \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$t_{hh\alpha}^B = \frac{1}{c_0} 2u_0 \sqrt{\frac{m}{m^*}k_{h\downarrow}q_{h\alpha}} \left(q_{e\alpha} + k_{e\uparrow}\right) \sqrt{\frac{\xi_s}{E_s}} e^{iX_0/2} \quad (\text{B8})$$

With the 7 coefficients defined, other 9 coefficients can be inferred from the symmetry of S matrix.

### Appendix C: Temperature Dependence of Spin Current

We show a comparison of the spin current with the two  $\mu_h$  values at a fixed polarization  $p_L = 0.99$  versus  $T/\mu_s$  in Fig. 12. For temperatures well below  $T_c = 0.375\mu_s$ ,  $\mu_h = 0$  yields a much larger spin current. As temperature approaches  $T_c$ ,  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc}$  becomes equivalent to the other condition because  $\mu_{hc}$  diminishes to 0 as temperature rises to  $T_c$ . This fact has been shown in Fig. 5(c).

### Appendix D: Scattering regimes

The fact that the four scattering modes, particle  $k_{p\uparrow}$ , hole  $k_{h\downarrow}$ , quasi-particle  $q_{p\alpha}$  and quasi-hole  $q_{h\alpha}$ , have different dispersion relationships gives rise to scattering regimes. Indeed,




FIG. 13. Alpha branch Scattering regimes in excitation energy  $E_\alpha$  vs transverse kinetic energy  $\xi_\perp$ . Normalized by  $\mu_s$ , the conditions of this graph are:  $T = 0.15$ ,  $p_L = 0.9$ ,  $\mu_h = \mu_{hc} = 1.07$ ,  $U_s = 1.10$ ,  $U_h = -0.67$ ,  $U_{L\uparrow} = 0.05$ ,  $U_{L\downarrow} = 1.44$ .

different scattering channels have different limits on the accessible excitation energy and transverse kinetic energy. For example, the  $\alpha$  branch superfluid quasi-particle and quasi-hole modes require a minimum energy  $E_{\min} = \Delta - \mu_h - U_h$ , which is not required for the particle and hole modes. The conditions are summarized in the Tab. I. We denote the energy intervals of  $E_\alpha$  and  $\xi_\perp \equiv \hbar^2 k_\perp^2 / (2m)$  in which all four channels are accessible as Regime I. There are three other regimes that contribute currents. An example of the scattering regimes is shown in Fig.13, with the chemical potential and Hartree energy values listed in the caption. Regime I allows all of the four scattering modes and all types of transmission. Regime II allows only the particle and hole modes and support only the Andreev-reflection type of transmission. Regime III allows the particle, quasiparticle and quasihole modes, and prohibits any transmission requiring the hole mode. Regime IV allows only the particle and quasiparticle modes and supports only the transmission between a particle and a quasiparticle. Regime V allows only the particle mode and, therefore, causes total reflection. Regime VI is the energetically forbidden regime, where the transverse kinetic energy exceeds the total kinetic energy. Since the Andreev current is important for the net current contribution, we present the formula for the Regime II:

$$j_{II,\alpha}^{\text{Net}} = \frac{2}{h} |r_{hp\alpha}^A|^2 [f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\uparrow) - f(E_\alpha - \delta\mu_\downarrow)] \quad (\text{D1})$$

Here the prefactor 2 is typical for the Andreev currents and indicates the transport of 2 atoms per scattering.

[1] Y.-i. Shin, C. H. Schunck, A. Schirotzek, and W. Ketterle, Nature **451**, 689 (2008).

[2] N. Navon, S. Nascimbène, F. Chevy, and C. Salomon,

	Accessible $E_\alpha$	Accessible $\xi_\perp$
$k_{p\uparrow}$	$[0, \infty)$	$[0, \mu_{\uparrow S} + U_{\uparrow N} + E_\alpha]$
$k_{h\downarrow}$	$[-\infty, U_{\downarrow N} + \mu_{\downarrow S}]$	$[0, \frac{m}{m}(\mu_{\downarrow S} + U_{\downarrow N} - E_\alpha)]$
$q_{p\alpha}$	$[\Delta - U_h - \mu_h, \infty)$	$[0, \mu_S + U_S + \sqrt{(E_\alpha + \mu_h + U_h)^2 - \Delta^2}]$
$q_{h\alpha}$	$[\Delta - U_h - \mu_h, \sqrt{(U_S + \mu_S)^2 + \Delta^2} - U_h - \mu_h]$	$[0, \mu_S + U_S - \sqrt{(E_\alpha + \mu_h + U_h)^2 - \Delta^2}]$
Mean field equation requires $E_\alpha \geq (-\mu_h - U_h)$		

TABLE I. Conditions on  $E_\alpha$  and  $\xi_\perp$  for each scattering channel

- Science **328**, 729 (2010).
- [3] S. Nascimbène, N. Navon, K. J. Jiang, F. Chevy, and C. Salomon, *Nature* **463**, 1057 (2010).
- [4] S. Nascimbène, N. Navon, S. Pilati, F. Chevy, S. Giorgini, A. Georges, and C. Salomon, *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 215303 (2011).
- [5] M. J. H. Ku, A. T. Sommer, L. W. Cheuk, and M. W. Zwierlein, *Science* **335**, 563 (2012).
- [6] K. Van Houcke, F. Werner, E. Kozik, N. Prokof'ev, B. Svistunov, M. J. H. Ku, A. T. Sommer, L. W. Cheuk, A. Schirotzek, and M. W. Zwierlein, *Nature Physics* **8**, 366 (2012).
- [7] A. Schirotzek, Y.-i. Shin, C. H. Schunck, and W. Ketterle, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 140403 (2008).
- [8] S. Hoinka, P. Dyke, M. G. Lingham, J. J. Kinnunen, G. M. Bruun, and C. J. Vale, *Nature Physics* **13**, 943 (2017).
- [9] A. Sommer, M. Ku, G. Roati, and M. W. Zwierlein, *Nature* **472**, 201 (2011).
- [10] A. Sommer, M. Ku, and M. W. Zwierlein, *New Journal of Physics* **13**, 055009 (2011).
- [11] C. Cao, E. Elliott, J. Joseph, H. Wu, J. Petricka, T. Schäfer, and J. E. Thomas, *Science* **331**, 58 (2011).
- [12] G. Valtolina, F. Scazza, A. Amico, A. Burchianti, A. Recati, T. Enss, M. Inguscio, M. Zaccanti, and G. Roati, *Nature Physics* **13**, 704 (2017).
- [13] J.-P. Brantut, J. Meineke, D. Stadler, S. Krinner, and T. Esslinger, *Science* **337**, 1069 (2012).
- [14] D. Husmann, S. Uchino, S. Krinner, M. Lebrat, T. Giamarchi, T. Esslinger, and J.-P. Brantut, *Science* **350**, 1498 (2015).
- [15] S. Krinner, M. Lebrat, D. Husmann, C. Grenier, J.-P. Brantut, and T. Esslinger, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**, 8144 (2016).
- [16] M. Kanász-Nagy, L. Glazman, T. Esslinger, and E. A. Demler, *Physical Review Letters* **117**, 255302 (2016).
- [17] S. Häusler, S. Nakajima, M. Lebrat, D. Husmann, S. Krinner, T. Esslinger, and J.-P. Brantut, *Physical Review Letters* **119**, 030403 (2017).
- [18] L. Corman, P. Fabritius, S. Häusler, J. Mohan, L. H. Dogra, D. Husmann, M. Lebrat, and T. Esslinger, *Physical Review A* **100**, 053605 (2019).
- [19] G. Valtolina, A. Burchianti, A. Amico, E. Neri, K. Xhani, J. A. Seman, A. Trombettoni, A. Smerzi, M. Zaccanti, M. Inguscio, and G. Roati, *Science* **350**, 1505 (2015).
- [20] A. Burchianti, F. Scazza, A. Amico, G. Valtolina, J. A. Seman, C. Fort, M. Zaccanti, M. Inguscio, and G. Roati, *Physical Review Letters* **120**, 025302 (2018).
- [21] S. Berggren, B. J. Taylor, E. E. Mitchell, K. E. Hannam, J. Y. Lazar, and A. Leese De Escobar, *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity* **26**, 1 (2016).
- [22] D. Perconte, F. A. Cuellar, C. Moreau-Luchaire, M. Piquemal-Banci, R. Galceran, P. R. Kidambi, M.-B. Martin, S. Hofmann, R. Bernard, B. Dlubak, P. Seneor, and J. E. Villegas, *Nature Physics* **14**, 25 (2018).
- [23] C. Visani, Z. Sefrioui, J. Tornos, C. Leon, J. Briatico, M. Bibes, A. Barthélémy, J. Santamaría, and J. E. Villegas, *Nature Physics* **8**, 539 (2012).
- [24] S. Komori, A. Di Bernardo, A. I. Buzdin, M. G. Blamire, and J. W. A. Robinson, *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 077003 (2018).
- [25] S. K. Baur, S. Basu, T. N. De Silva, and E. J. Mueller, *Physical Review A* **79**, 063628 (2009).
- [26] S. Pilati and S. Giorgini, *Physical Review Letters* **100**, 030401 (2008).
- [27] X.-J. Liu, H. Hu, and P. D. Drummond, *Physical Review A* **78**, 023601 (2008).
- [28] B. A. Olsen, M. C. Revelle, J. A. Fry, D. E. Sheehy, and R. G. Hulet, *Physical Review A* **92**, 063616 (2015).
- [29] M. J. M. de Jong and C. W. J. Beenakker, *Physical Review Letters* **74**, 1657 (1995).
- [30] K. Halterman and O. T. Valls, *Physical Review B* **69**, 014517 (2004).
- [31] T. Kashimura, S. Tsuchiya, and Y. Ohashi, *Physical Review A* **82**, 033617 (2010).
- [32] B. Van Schaeybroeck and A. Lazarides, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 170402 (2007).
- [33] B. Van Schaeybroeck and A. Lazarides, *Physical Review A* **79**, 053612 (2009).
- [34] M. M. Parish and D. A. Huse, *Physical Review A* **80**, 063605 (2009).
- [35] P. Magierski, B. Tüzemen, and G. Włazłowski, *Physical Review A* **100**, 033613 (2019).
- [36] C. Mora and F. Chevy, *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 230402 (2010).
- [37] G. E. Blonder, M. Tinkham, and T. M. Klapwijk, *Physical Review B* **25**, 4515 (1982).
- [38] A. Schirotzek, C.-H. Wu, A. Sommer, and M. W. Zwierlein, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 230402 (2009).
- [39] R. Combescot and S. Giraud, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 050404 (2008).
- [40] N. Prokof'ev and B. Svistunov, *Physical Review B* **77**, 020408 (2008).
- [41] Z. Yan, P. B. Patel, B. Mukherjee, R. J. Fletcher, J. Struck, and M. W. Zwierlein, *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 093401 (2019).
- [42] B. Mukherjee, Z. Yan, P. B. Patel, Z. Hadzibabic, T. Yefsah, J. Struck, and M. W. Zwierlein, *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 123401 (2017).
- [43] P. Magierski, G. Włazłowski, A. Bulgac, and J. E. Drut, *Physical Review Letters* **103**, 210403 (2009).
- [44] H. Tajima, R. Hanai, and Y. Ohashi, *Physical Review A* **93**, 013610 (2016).
- [45] T. Kashimura, R. Watanabe, and Y. Ohashi, *Physical Review A* **86**, 043622 (2012).
- [46] G. Włazłowski, P. Magierski, J. E. Drut, A. Bulgac, and K. J. Roche, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 090401 (2013).
- [47] L. Rammelmüller, A. C. Loheac, J. E. Drut, and J. Braun, *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 173001 (2018).

- [48] C. Sanner, E. J. Su, A. Keshet, W. Huang, J. Gillen, R. Gommers, and W. Ketterle, *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 010402 (2011).
- [49] J. Meineke, J.-P. Brantut, D. Stadler, T. Müller, H. Moritz, and T. Esslinger, *Nature Physics* **8**, 454 (2012).
- [50] Y.-i. Shin, *Physical Review A* **77**, 041603 (2008).