CPHT-RR100.122019

Normal charge densities in quantum critical superfluids

Blaise Goutéraux[1,*] and Eric Mefford[1,†]

[1] *CPHT, CNRS, École Polytechnique, IP Paris, F-91128 Palaiseau, France*

(Dated: March 13, 2024)

Abstract

The normal density of a translation-invariant superfluid often vanishes at zero temperature, as is observed in superfluid Helium and conventional superconductors described by BCS theory. Here we show that this need not be the case. We investigate the normal density in models of quantum critical superfluids using gauge-gravity duality. Models with an emergent infrared Lorentz symmetry lead to a vanishing normal density. On the other hand, models which break the isotropy between time and space may enjoy a non-vanishing normal density, depending on the spectrum of irrelevant deformations around the underlying quantum critical groundstate. Our results may shed light on recent measurements of the superfluid density and low energy spectral weight in superconducting overdoped cuprates.

arXiv:1912.08849v3 [hep-th] 23 Nov 2020

INTRODUCTION

Much of traditional superfluid and BEC superconductor phenomenology can be explained by Landau and Tisza's simple two-fluid hydrodynamical model [1, 2] and its relativistic generalizations [3–9]. The Landau-Tisza model describes the superfluid as a mixture of two fluid components, the normal, dissipative state with charge density ρ_n and velocity u_μ and the dissipationless superfluid with charge density ρ_s and flow velocity v_μ. The total charge density is the sum of both components, $\rho = \rho_n + \rho_s$. Experiments and theoretical calcuations in ^{3}He, ^{4}He, cold atom experiments, and conventional BCS superconductors all lead to the result that the system becomes entirely superfluid at zero temperature, ie that the normal density vanishes:

$$\rho_n^{(0)} \equiv \lim_{T\to 0} \rho_n = 0. \tag{1}$$

In [10, 11], two arguments were given to account for (1). One argument used only the superfluid hydrodynamic description, the other assumed a weakly-coupled, Galilean, time-reversal invariant, single species superfluid.

The expectation (1) was called into question by recent experimental reports of anomalously low superfluid densities in overdoped high-T_c superconductors [12] (see [13, 14] for commentary). Subsequent spectroscopic studies [15] also revealed very little loss of low energy spectral weight at low temperatures in the superconducting phase, suggesting a non-vanishing $\rho_n^{(0)}$. While the authors of [16–18] attributed this to disorder effects that can be captured in the so-called 'dirty BCS' theory, fitting the experimental data relies on an ad hoc renormalization of the Drude weight [17]. Thus, no theoretical consensus has been reached on the experimental findings of [12, 15], see also [19, 20].

In this work, we tackle this question by combining methods using superfluid hydrodynamics and gauge-gravity duality. We review translation and time-reversal invariant superfluid hydrodynamics and show that the hydrodynamic equations are not enough to conclude that (1) is true. Instead, determining $\rho_n^{(0)}$ requires knowledge of the infrared (IR) equation of state. Using holographic models with quantum critical dynamics in the infrared as examples, we show (1) holds for strongly-coupled superfluids with an emergent Lorentz symmetry, in agreement with [10, 11]. This is also consistent with the superfluid effective field theory discussed in [21–23]. On the other hand, we find that non-relativistic quantum critical systems with dynamical critical exponent $z > 1$ can have $\rho_n^{(0)} \neq 0$. Hence, we conclude that a non-vanishing $\rho_n^{(0)}$ is not a result of the breakdown of the two-fluid model but rather a result

of the quantum critical nature of the IR of these superfluids. Even after explicitly breaking translations, we show this conclusion does not change. These findings may suggest the anomalously low superfluid density and suppression of spectral weight observed in [12, 15] might be a consequence of the quantum critical properties of the superconducting phase of overdoped cuprates.

On a more formal level, our results indicate that the quantum effective action of Lifshitz superfluids differs significantly from that of their Lorentzian cousins [21], which opens exciting perspectives for future research on the theory of superfluids.

$\rho_n^{(0)}$ IN SUPERFLUID HYDRODYNAMICS

In this section, we review relativistic, charged, superfluid hydrodynamics, following [24]. For our purposes, it is sufficient to work at the non-dissipative level. Our results apply to any theory with translation invariance, including Galilean invariant theories. Relativistic symmetry leads to simpler notation and aligns nicely with our holographic example. A more thorough derivation can be found in Appendix A.

The system is described by the following equations (setting the speed of light $c = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} &= 0, & \partial_\mu j^\mu &= 0, \\ u^\mu \partial_\mu \varphi + \mu &= 0, & \partial_\mu (s u^\mu) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The first line expresses the local conservation laws: the conservation of the fluid stress tensor and the conservation of the $U(1)$ symmetry current, respectively. The last line states the constraints from gauge invariance and thermodynamics; respectively, a "Josephson equation" which relates the time component of the background gauge field to the phase of the superfluid, φ, and the statement that in equilibrium, the entropy density is conserved. For simplicity, we have turned off external sources, which in particular corresponds to a choice of gauge $A_\mu = 0$ for the external gauge field. The conclusions of this work are independent of the choice of gauge, see Appendix A.

Hydrodynamics states that these equations can be solved in terms of a derivative expansion of local thermodynamic variables and the fluid velocity. At non-dissipative order, thermodynamics of the equilibrium state fixes

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\mu\nu} &= (\epsilon_n + P) u^\mu u^\nu + P \eta^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu} \partial^\mu \varphi \partial^\nu \varphi \\ j^\mu &= \rho_n u^\mu + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu} \partial^\mu \varphi. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The total charge density is the sum of the normal, ρ_n, and superfluid, ρ_s, densities. The distinction between ρ_n and ρ_s follows from the expectation that u^μ is the velocity of entropy flow which is carried purely by the normal component. The normal energy density, ϵ_n, and pressure, P, satisfy the Smarr and Gibbs relations,

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_n + P &= Ts + \rho_n \mu\,, \\ dP &= sdT + \rho d\mu - \frac{\rho_s}{2\mu} d(\partial_\nu \varphi \partial^\nu \varphi + \mu^2)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We perturb about equilibrium, writing $T = T_0 + \delta T$, $\mu = \mu_0 + \delta\mu$, $u^\mu = (1, \delta u^i)^\mu$, $\varphi = -\mu_0 t + \delta\varphi$. The fluctuation equations can be massaged into the form

$$0 = (\mu\rho_n + sT)\partial_t \delta u_i + \rho_s \partial_t \partial_i \delta\varphi + s\partial_i T + \rho \partial_i \delta\mu. \tag{5}$$

If $s \to 0$ as $T \to 0$, consistency of this equation requires

$$\rho_n^{(0)} \partial_t (\mu \delta u_i - \partial_i \delta\varphi) = 0. \tag{6}$$

If δu_i and $\delta\varphi$ were allowed to fluctuate independently, we would conclude $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$, as in [10, 11].

However, introducing an external source for φ through $\delta H = \int d^2x s_\varphi \cdot \partial\varphi$ leads to $s^i_\varphi = \rho_s(\partial^i\varphi - \mu u^i)$, see Appendix A and [25]. Setting the external source to zero, the superfluid velocity $v^i \equiv \partial_i\varphi/\mu$ is aligned with the fluid velocity u^i and equation (6) is automatically satisfied. Therefore, consistent coupling of the hydrodynamics to external sources evades the conclusion that $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$.

The fluctuations lead to an electrical conductivity at non-dissipative order [26],[1]

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{i}{\omega} G^R_{J^x J^x}(\omega, 0) = \frac{i}{\omega}\left[\frac{\rho_n^2}{\mu\rho_n + sT} + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu}\right]. \tag{7}$$

Importantly, $\lim_{T\to 0} \omega Im[\sigma] = \rho/\mu$, irrespective of whether $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$ or not. Here, as well as everywhere in the rest of our work, we take the $\omega \to 0$ limit before the $T \to 0$ limit. The Kramers-Kronig relations require that $Re[\sigma]$ also has a delta function as $\omega \to 0$ with the same weight. Eq. (7) applies equally well to superconductors with a dynamical gauge field, as the conductivity is measured with respect to the total electric field, which relates it to the unscreened retarded Green's function.

[1] In general, contact terms may affect the conductivities [27], but this is not the case for the electric conductivity of interest here.

If we explicitly break translations weakly, the momentum relaxes slowly with an inverse lifetime Γ and the conductivity becomes

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{\rho_n^2}{\mu\rho_n + sT}\frac{1}{\Gamma - i\omega} + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu}\left(\frac{i}{\omega}\right). \tag{8}$$

The imaginary pole is now proportional only to the superfluid density, though this says nothing about $\rho_n^{(0)}$. Importantly, there are no inconsistencies if $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$ when translations are broken, as we will demonstrate.

HOLOGRAPHIC QUANTUM CRITICAL SUPERFLUIDS

Holography relates the low energy dynamics of a finite temperature strongly interacting gauge theory with a large number of colors in $d+1$ spacetime dimensions to the dynamics of a classical gravitational system in $d+2$ dimensions with a black hole [28, 29]. While explicit examples are known from string theory which fix the action of the gravitational theory, applied holography posits that a consistent set of a small number of fields, such as scalars and $U(1)$ gauge fields, coupled to gravity in $(d+2)$ anti-de Sitter spacetime is able to capture the universal low energy dynamics of a large number of strongly interacting quantum systems near a quantum critical point or phase [30].

In particular, these quantum critical theories should be characterized by the dependence of correlation functions on certain universal exponents, for instance the dynamical critical exponent, z, the hyperscaling violation parameter θ, and the spatial dimension d. Holographically, these exponents are captured by an extremal (zero temperature) horizon of the form [31, 32]

$$ds^2 = r^{2\frac{\theta}{d}-2}\left[-L_t^2\frac{dt^2}{r^{2z-2}} + \tilde{L}^2 dr^2 + L_x^2 d\boldsymbol{x}^2\right] \tag{9}$$

where the horizon is at $r \to \infty$ when $z \geq 1$. The radial coordinate r functions as a renormalization scale so that under scale transformations,

$$(r, x^i) \to \lambda(r, x^i) \quad t \to \lambda^z t \Rightarrow ds^2 \to \lambda^{2\frac{\theta}{d}} ds^2. \tag{10}$$

This implies that the thermodynamic parameters have dimension $[T] = z$ and $[s] = d - \theta$ and $s \sim T^{\frac{d-\theta}{z}}$.

A very general gravitational model which can lead to these extremal solutions is the following, [33],

$$S = \int d^{d+2}x\sqrt{-g}\left[R - \frac{Z(\phi)}{4}F^2 - |D\eta|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - V(\phi,|\eta|) - \frac{Y(\phi)}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{d}(\partial\psi_i)^2\right]. \tag{11}$$

Here, A_M is a $U(1)$ gauge field with field strength $F_{MN} = \partial_M A_N - \partial_N A_M$. The field η is a complex scalar with $U(1)$ charge Q and covariant derivative $D\eta = (\partial_M - iQA_M)\eta$. When $|\eta| \neq 0$, the $U(1)$ symmetry is broken and the dual theory can be thought of as a superfluid [34, 35]. The field ϕ is a neutral scalar called the dilaton which has a source on the boundary ϕ_s. The fields ψ_I are chosen to have linear dependence on the spatial dimensions, $\psi_i = mx^j\delta_{ij}$ so that when $Y \neq 0$, they explicitly break translation but not rotation invariance [36]. The gauge field is chosen only to have a background time component whose value at the boundary of AdS sets the chemical potential, μ, which sources a charge density, ρ. We have set $16\pi G = 1$. See Appendix B for further details.

The relativistic invariant equations of superfluidity described above were shown to hold in holographic models where the transport coefficients can be derived from the gravitational dual to the boundary fluid [24, 37–41]. Though the early holographic models focused on the original holographic superfluid [34, 35, 42], the bulk action can be generalized as in (43) to include running couplings and bounded scalar potentials [33, 43–45]. We find that the two-fluid hydrodynamic model still works well in describing these models.

The solutions (9) are found for potentials which behave in the IR as

$$\begin{aligned} &Y(\phi \to \infty) \to Y_0 e^{\lambda\phi}, \quad V(\phi, |\eta|) \to V_0 e^{-\delta\phi}, \\ &Z(\phi \to \infty) \to Z_0 e^{\gamma\phi}, \quad \phi = \kappa \ln(r)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The gauge field and translation breaking scalars can be engineered to be marginal or irrelevant deformations of the IR critical phase, [32, 46]. We will be concerned with phases where the charged scalar is irrelevant in the IR, taking the asymptotic value η_0 [33]. This implies that the scaling exponents are the same in the superfluid as in the normal phase, so that many of the scaling properties at low temperature are inherited from the normal phase.

NORMAL DENSITIES IN HOLOGRAPHIC SUPERFLUIDS

To find the normal density (see also [37]), we perturb our system by turning on a spatially homogeneous infinitesimal external electric field in the x-direction, $E_x e^{-i\omega t}$, sourcing both an electric and a momentum current, see Appendix B. As $\omega \to 0$, the equation for the momentum current enforces $\langle T_{tx}\rangle = -\rho\delta\xi_x$, where $\delta\xi_x = \partial_x\varphi - A_x$ is gauge-invariant, and given by the electric field $\delta\xi_x = E_x/(i\omega)$ in a gauge where $\varphi = 0$, which is the gauge we work in. This response requires that $\mu\delta u_x = \delta\xi_x$, see Appendix C.

In the companion paper [47], we explore transport in the superfluid phases of the holo-

graphic model (43) for general potentials in greater detail. Here, for illustrative purposes, we present an explicit example in $d = 2$ that leads to $\rho_n^{(0)} \neq 0$ and one that leads to $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$, including when translations are broken. Specifically, we use the model of [33] with

$$Z = e^{\frac{\phi}{\sqrt{3}}}, \quad V = -6\cosh\left(\phi/\sqrt{3}\right) - 2|\eta|^2 + |\eta|^4, \quad Y = 0. \tag{13}$$

Upon varying the dilaton source, this model has two IR phases characterized by critical exponents,

$$\left(z, \theta, \frac{z}{\theta}\right) = (+\infty, -\infty, -1) \quad \text{or} \quad (z, \theta) = (1, -1). \tag{14}$$

In the first case, we first need to redefine $r \mapsto r^{1/z}$ before sending $z \to +\infty$ in (9). The IR behavior of ϕ in the two phases is $\phi = \pm\sqrt{3}\ln(r)$. In the first case, $Z(\phi)$ diverges and leads to a finite electric flux, $\rho_{in}^{(0)}$, from the extremal horizon, suggesting a "fractionalization" of charged degrees of freedom into a subset confined in the condensate and subset deconfined in the thermal bath hidden by the horizon [48, 49]. In the second case, $Z(\phi) \to 0$ causing the flux to vanish in the IR and all charged degrees of freedom are confined into the charged condensate in a "cohesive" phase.

These two cases can also be distinguished by the vanishing of $\rho_n^{(0)}$ in the cohesive phase and non-vanishing of $\rho_n^{(0)}$ in the fractionalized phase. We emphasize that, despite their apparent similarities, $\rho_n^{(0)}$ and $\rho_{in}^{(0)}$ are not immediately related. The first is a quantity defined in the two-fluid hydrodynamic model while the second is a microscopic measurement of the uncondensed degrees of freedom. This is analogous to BEC superconductivity where not all electrons condense into Cooper pairs, yet $\rho_n \to 0$ [50]. In fact, in [47], we discuss pure Lifshitz superfluid solutions [43, 44] in which $\rho_{in}^{(0)}$ vanishes while $\rho_n^{(0)}$ does not, for sufficiently large z.

After solving for the bulk $\delta\xi_x(r)$, we combine (7) with the knowledge of the total background charge density $\rho = \rho_s + \rho_n$ to extract both ρ_n and ρ_s. Our numerical results are shown in Fig.1. In [47], we show analytically that

$$\text{fractionalized: } \rho_n \simeq \frac{\rho_n^{(0)}}{\mu^2} + \#T^{1-\frac{\theta}{z}} + \ldots \tag{15}$$

$$\text{cohesive: } \rho_n \simeq \frac{1 - c_{IR}^2}{c_{IR}^2}\frac{sT}{\mu} + \ldots \sim T^{\frac{(2+z-\theta)}{z}} \tag{16}$$

where $\rho_n^{(0)}$ depends on UV parameters, for instance, the source, ϕ_s, and $c_{IR} \equiv L_t/L_x\, r_h^{1-z} \sim T^{1-1/z}$ is the lightcone velocity in the IR. The ... indicate terms from more irrelevant deformations of the IR geometry. Interestingly, the leading order temperature dependencies




Figure 1. Temperature dependence of ρ_n/ρ in the cohesive (left) and fractionalized (right) phases.

of the normal density behave as power-laws with exponents determined by the underlying IR phase, characteristic of quantum critical systems. This is in contrast to BCS superconductivity, in which it is found that ρ_n is exponentially suppressed [10]. On the other hand, in ^{4}He, the normal (mass) density is controlled by phonons (the goldstones from the $U(1)$ breaking) so that $\rho_n = \frac{(sT)}{c_p^2} + O(c_p^{-1})$ where the coefficient is the phonon speed of sound, c_p [51]. This is identical to (16), trading $c_{IR} \mapsto c_p$ and taking the limit $c_p \ll 1$.

In [47], we find that $\rho_n^{(0)}$ depends on the competition between two terms proportional to sT and c_{IR}^2, respectively.[2] If c_{IR}^2 dominates at low T, then $\rho_n^{(0)} \neq 0$. Otherwise, $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$ and to leading order ρ_n is given by (16). This result is consistent with the relativistic superfluid effective field theory [23], but is also true for $z \neq 1$. For the quantum critical superfluids presented here, fractionalized phases ($\rho_{in}^{(0)} \neq 0$) always have $c_{IR}^2 > sT$ and hence $\rho_n^{(0)} \neq 0$, whereas for cohesive phases ($\rho_{in}^{(0)} = 0$), this occurs for:

$$\text{cohesive:} \qquad z < d + 2 - \theta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \rho_n^{(0)} = 0. \tag{17}$$

We observe that when (17) is violated, (16) would naively lead to a divergent $\rho_n^{(0)}$. Instead, as we have just explained, a more careful calculation leads to a finite $\rho_n^{(0)} \neq 0$.

[2] The terms arise from the breaking of particle-hole symmetry and gauge invariance, respectively. Denoting the relative temperature dependence of these two terms by T^α, we find a more general criteria $\alpha < d + 2 - \theta - z \Rightarrow \rho_n^{(0)} = 0$. Here, we have $\alpha = 0$. In different models [47] than the ones considered here, we can find fractionalized phases which have $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$, similar to ^{4}He.




Figure 2. Varying depletion of spectral weight in the real part of $\sigma(\omega)$ due to the superfluid in the presence of broken translations ($m/\mu = 10^{-2}$). Lower depletion is correlated with a larger $\rho_n^{(0)}$. The curves are the real part of (8).

Generically, many irrelevant deformations of the criticial IR geometry compete to drive the system toward the UV. In particular, while a universal deformation proportional to sT always exists, dangerously irrelevant operators may control the temperature dependence of thermodynamic or transport observables [32, 52, 53]. It is then remarkable that the criteria in (17) leads to the universal temperature dependence (16) for cohesive phases.

As a final illustration that $\rho_n^{(0)} \neq 0$ is a signature of criticality rather than, for instance, disorder, we explicitly break translations in (43), with $Y(\phi) = \exp\left(\mp\phi/\sqrt{3}\right)$, where the minus sign is for fractionalized phases and the plus for cohesive phases. This choice ensures that translation breaking is sufficiently irrelevant to not destabilize the IR geometry. We omit the detailed accounting of gauge invariant fluctuations which can be found, for instance, in [54]. Due to the introduction of broken translations, we confirm $\lim_{\omega\to 0}\omega\mathrm{Im}[\sigma] = \rho_s/\mu$ (see also [55–57]) as in (8) and find $\Gamma = m^2 sY(r_h)/(4\pi[\mu\rho_n + sT])$ as follows from [32], see figure 2. Furthermore, the temperature dependence in Eqs. (15,16) does not change. In particular, translation symmetry breaking does not necessarily give rise to finite $\rho_n^{(0)}$ in the cohesive phase. Instead, $\rho_n^{(0)}$ is controlled by the underlying criticality.

LOW TEMPERATURE BEHAVIOR OF HYDRODYNAMIC MODES

Eq. (16) has interesting consequences on the spectrum of hydrodynamic modes at low temperatures. The superfluid second sound velocity is given by [37, 39]

$$c_2^2 = \left(\frac{s}{\rho}\right)^2 \frac{\rho_s}{(sT+\mu\rho_n)(\partial[s/\rho]/\partial T)_\mu}\,. \tag{18}$$

Using (16) and $s \sim T^{(d-\theta)/z}$, we find $c_2^2 = z c_{IR}^2/(d-\theta)$. This is the generalization of Landau's conjecture [58] to critical IR geometries. For fractionalized phases, on the other hand, we find $c_2^2 \sim sT$, which decays parametrically faster with temperature than c_{IR} when (17) holds. In both cases, the superfluid sound velocity vanishes at $T = 0$. This is in marked contrast to the relativistic case $z = 1$ and the superfluid effective field theory [23], which lead to a non-vanishing $T = 0$ superfluid velocity. We expect the Goldstone mode should interpolate to a dispersion relation $\omega \sim k^z$ in the limit $T \ll k$. It would be interesting to work this out in our model.

Fourth sound is defined as the sound mode which propagates when the normal velocity vanishes [58], given by

$$c_4^2 = \frac{\rho_s}{\mu\left(\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial\mu}\right)_s} \simeq \frac{\rho_s}{d\rho}. \tag{19}$$

In the second equality, we have used the low temperature behavior, $\rho \sim \mu^d$. Thus, fourth sound provides a direct measure of whether $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$, since then $c_4^2 = 1/d$. This result explains some observations reported in previous literature, [37, 59]. In dirty superfluids with broken translations, only fourth sound survives. In particular, (19) matches the expressions in [60]. Thus, measuring superfluid sound in impure, quantum critical superfluids would give direct information on whether $\rho_n^{(0)} = 0$ or not.

DISCUSSION

In this manuscript, we have shown that a non-vanishing $\rho_n^{(0)}$ is consistent with the Landau-Tisza two-fluid model of superfluidity. This is because in the absence of external sources, fluctuations in the normal velocity are aligned with fluctuations in the superfluid velocity, $\mu\delta u_i = \partial_i\delta\varphi$. We illustrated this using a model of holographic superfluidity and showed that $\rho_n^{(0)}$ is controlled by the underlying quantum critical phase. Experimental evidence for a non-vanishing $\rho_n^{(0)}$ in the cuprates can be considered further evidence for the existence of an underlying quantum critical phase in those systems. It would be interesting to find more




Figure 3. Left: The linear specific heat slope, γ_0, as a function of the dilaton source, ϕ_s, mimicking Fig. (5) of [61]. Right: The zero temperature densities as a function of ϕ_s compared to the total density with no superfluid, $\rho_{T,ns}$ mimicking Fig. (2e) of [15]. Two special points are indicated: ϕ_s^c marks the phase transition between cohesive and fractionalized phases and ϕ_s^* marks the phase transition to a totally fractionalized phase with superfluidity completely suppressed, $\rho_s^{(0)} = 0$.

experimental examples of non-vanishing $\rho_n^{(0)}$, perhaps in cold atom experiments, which we expect would be a generic feature of quantum criticality.

The holographic models discussed here exhibit further similarities to experimental observations in the cuprates. In overdoped $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$, [61, 62], heat capacity measurements reveal a linear in temperature component at low temperatures, $c \sim \gamma_0 T + O(T^2)$. The coefficient, γ_0, is a measure of the density of normal charge carriers and exhibits strong doping dependence that is correlated with strong depletion of spectral weight in the optical conductivity [12, 15]. Interpreting a source for the dilaton, ϕ_s, as a proxy for doping,[3] our models exhibit the same behavior, illustrated in figures 2 and 3. The rapid depletion arises from the underlying quantum critical point separating the cohesive phase in which $\gamma_0 = 0$ and the fractionalized phase in which $\gamma_0 \neq 0$. As we have illustrated, this phase transition also separates phases in which $\rho_n^{(0)}$ does and does not vanish. Together, these observations

[3] In using ϕ_s/μ as a proxy for doping, we note that its variation triggers a quantum phase transition between a superfluid and normal phase. Similarly to doping, increasing ϕ_s/μ increases the total charge density, $\rho_T^{(0)}$, as well as amplifies the effect of momentum breaking (increased disorder strength), see Appendix D.

give further evidence that a transition between two types of quantum critical phases may explain the phenomenology in the overdoped cuprates, see also [63–65].

As a final remark, we observe that in a Lifshitz quantum critical fractionalized phase, our result (15) implies $\rho_s \simeq \rho_s^{(0)} + \#T^{1-\theta/z}$. Setting $\theta = 0$, the superfluid density displays a universal T-linear scaling for all $z > 1$. A similar observation was reported by recent experiments in overdoped $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ [12]. For $z = 2$, the heat capacity will also receive a T-linear contribution. The value $z = 2$ has appeared previously in theoretical models of high T_c superconductors, see e.g. [66–68].

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Nigel Hussey, Catherine Pepin, and Steve Kivelson for useful discussions. In addition, we would like to thank Tomas Andrade and Richard Davison for initial collaboration at an early stage of this project. We would also like to thank Luca Delacrétaz for many discussions on superfluid hydrodynamics. We are grateful to Richard Davison, Sean Hartnoll, Chris Herzog and Jan Zaanen for helpful comments on a previous version of this manuscript. We would especially like to thank Jan Zaanen who first brought the results of [12] to our attention at the Aspen Center for Physics, where this work was initiated and which is supported by National Science Foundation grant PHY-1607611. This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No.758759).

Appendix A: Details of the hydrodynamics

Here, we go into more detail about the linearized hydrodynamic fluctuations used to derive Eq. (6) of the main text, keeping the discussion self-contained. For completeness, we will write everything in a gauge invariant way, using the variable $\xi_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu \varphi - A_\mu$ where A_μ is a background gauge field.

As pointed out in the main text, the system is described by the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} &= F^{\mu\nu} j_\mu, \\ \partial_\mu j^\mu &= 0, \\ u^\mu \xi_\mu + \mu &= 0, \\ \partial_\mu (s u^\mu) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The first two equations express the local conservation laws: the first is the conservation of the fluid stress tensor and the second is the conservation of the $U(1)$ symmetry current. The last two equations are required by gauge invariance and thermodynamics: the third equation

is a "Josephson equation" which relates the time component of the background gauge field to the phase of the superfluid. The final equation states that in equilibrium, the entropy density is conserved.

Hydrodynamics states that these equations can be solved in terms of a derivative expansion of local thermodynamic variables and the fluid velocity. At non-dissipative order, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\mu\nu} &= (\epsilon_n + P)u^\mu u^\nu + P\eta^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu}\xi^\mu\xi^\nu \\ j^\mu &= \rho_n u^\mu + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu}\xi^\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

There are no contributions from $F_{\mu\nu}$ since these are first order in derivatives of the thermodynamic variables. In writing these equations, we have explicitly chosen the entropy current to lie along u^μ since we expect only the normal component to transport entropy. This serves as a *definition* of the normal component of the fluid. The total charge density is $\rho = \rho_n + \rho_s$ and the normal energy density, ϵ_n, and pressure, P, satisfy the Smarr relation and Gibbs relations,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_n + P &= Ts + \rho_n\mu, \\ dP &= sdT + \rho d\mu - \frac{\rho_s}{2\mu}d(\xi_\nu\xi^\nu + \mu^2) \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Note that the true energy density, $\epsilon \equiv T^{00} = \epsilon_n + \mu\rho_s$.

We now look at fluctuations about equilibrium. Here it is useful to choose a frame, for instance one in which the normal and superfluid components are at rest. We emphasize that this choice does not affect the argument. We write $T = T^{(0)} + \delta T$, $\mu = \mu^{(0)} + \delta\mu$, $u^\mu = (1, \delta u^i)^\mu$, $\xi_0 = -\mu + \delta\xi_0$, $\xi_i = \delta\xi_i$. The fluctuations in the fluid stress tensor and current become.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta T^{00} &= \delta\epsilon \\ \delta T^{0i} &= (\mu\rho_n + sT)\delta u^i + \rho_s\delta\xi^i \\ \delta T^{ij} &= \delta P\ \delta^{ij} \\ \delta j^0 &= \delta\rho \\ \delta j^i &= \rho_n\delta u^i + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu}\delta\xi^i \\ \delta\xi_0 &= -\delta\mu \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Hence, the set of equations (20) now become,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_0 \delta\epsilon + (\mu\rho_n + sT)\partial_i \delta u^i + \rho_s \partial_i \delta\xi^i \\ \rho\ \delta F_{0i} &= (\mu\rho_n + sT)\partial_0 \delta u^i + \rho_s \partial_0 \delta\xi^i + \partial^i \delta P \\ 0 &= \partial_0 \delta\rho + \rho_n \partial_i \delta u^i + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu}\partial_i \delta\xi^i \\ 0 &= \partial_i \delta\xi_0 + \partial_i \delta\mu \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Using the Gibbs relation, the second equation can be rewritten

$$-\rho\delta F_{i0} = (\mu\rho_n + sT)\partial_0 \delta u_i + \rho_s \partial_0 \delta\xi_i + s\partial_i \delta T + (\rho_n + \rho_s)\partial_i \delta\mu. \tag{25}$$

Finally, if $s \to 0$ as $T \to 0$, consistency of these equations requires

$$\rho_n \partial_0(\mu\delta u_i - \delta\xi_i) = 0. \tag{26}$$

In [10], supposing independence of δu_i and $\delta\xi_i$ requires $\rho_n = 0$. As we show in the main text, $\partial_0(\mu\delta u_i - \delta\xi_i)$ generically vanishes. We can obtain this conclusion by consistently considering sources for the thermodynamic variables in the Hamiltonian [25].

An external source deforms the Hamiltonian in linear response as

$$\delta H(t) = -\sum_A \int d^2\boldsymbol{x} A(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\delta s_A(\boldsymbol{x}, t). \tag{27}$$

A small constant source applied in the infinite past and suddenly switched off at $t = 0$,

$$\delta s_A(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \delta s_A(\boldsymbol{x}) e^{\varepsilon t}\theta(-t) \tag{28}$$

leads to a response in A given by the matrix of static susceptibilities (Fourier transformed),

$$\delta\langle A(\boldsymbol{k}, t = 0) = \sum_B \chi_{BA}(\boldsymbol{k})\delta s_B(\boldsymbol{k}). \tag{29}$$

Here $\varepsilon \to 0^+$ leads to nice analyticity properties. Notably, if the source is a hydrodynamic variable, then $\chi_{AB} = \chi_{BA}$.

Define $v^i = \frac{1}{\mu}\xi^i$. The first law tells us that the Hamiltonian must contain a term

$$H \supset \int d^2x \frac{\mu\rho_s}{2} \sum_i (v^i)^2. \tag{30}$$

Fluctuations in v^i due to a source $s_{v,i}$ are obtained via the Hamiltonian deformation,

$$\delta H = -\int d^2x \sum_i s_{v,i} v^i \tag{31}$$

which, at linear order, implies from (23),

$$\langle v^i \rangle = \frac{s_v^i}{\mu \rho_s} \Rightarrow \chi_{P^i v^i} \equiv \frac{\delta T^{i0}}{\delta s_v^i} = 1. \tag{32}$$

On the other hand, we must have

$$\chi_{P^i v^i} = \chi_{v^i P^i} \equiv \frac{\delta v^i}{\delta u^i} = 1 \tag{33}$$

so in fact

$$s_v^i = \mu \rho_s (v^i - u^i). \tag{34}$$

In the absence of external sources, $s_v^i = 0 \Rightarrow v^i = u^i$ so that the superfluid and normal velocities are aligned and we have

$$\mu \delta u_i = \xi_i \tag{35}$$

in linear response. We further note that within the context of linear response, the equations (23) also imply the electric conductivity (at non-dissipative order)

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{i}{\omega} \left[\frac{\rho_n^2}{\mu \rho_n + sT} + \frac{\rho_s}{\mu} \right]. \tag{36}$$

Since $\rho = \rho_n + \rho_s$, the pole in the imaginary frequency can be used to directly find ρ_n

$$\lim_{\omega \to 0} \omega \mathrm{Im}[\sigma(\omega)] = \frac{\rho}{\mu} - \left(\frac{sT}{\mu} \right) \frac{\rho_n}{\mu \rho_n + sT}. \tag{37}$$

Next, consider fluctuations with a spatially varying source with momentum $k^\mu = (0, \hat{k}^i)^\mu$. Fluctuations in the superfluid velocity are parallel to $\hat{k}$. Hence, if we look at transverse fluctuations, $\hat{\xi}$ does not contribute. In particular, the transverse momentum fluctuations obey

$$\delta T^{0\perp} = (\mu \rho_n + sT) \delta u^\perp \Rightarrow \chi_{P^\perp P^\perp} = \mu \rho_n + sT \tag{38}$$

where $\chi_{P^\perp P^\perp}$ follows from a discussion similar to $\chi_{\hat{v}\hat{P}}$. So far, we have omitted dissipative terms in our hydrodynamic discussion. They can be found, for instance, in [25, 39]. Upon their inclusion, one finds a diffusion pole satisfying the Einstein relation

$$\chi_{P^\perp P^\perp} = \frac{\eta}{D_\perp}, \tag{39}$$

see for instance the discussion below Eq. (4.21) of [25]. Here, η is the shear viscosity which relaxes gradients in the transverse component of the normal fluid velocity and $D_\perp$

is the momentum diffusion constant which controls the rate of relaxation of the conserved transverse momentum. We also find two propagating modes, an adiabatic sound mode with $c_1^2 = (\partial P/\partial\epsilon)_{S,N}$, and second sound [25],

$$c_2^2 = \left(\frac{s}{\rho}\right)^2 \frac{\rho_s}{(\partial[s/\rho]/\partial T)_\mu}\left(\frac{D_\perp}{\eta}\right) \tag{40}$$

That the second sound velocity and transverse diffusion/viscosity are related may be surprising because naively second sound is a longitudinal mode whereas shear diffusion is a transverse mode. However, as opposed to conventional sound which transports density fluctuations, second sound only transports heat while maintaining a constant local charge density (the normal and superfluid components are out of phase). This relaxation of transverse velocity gradients in the normal fluid is an effective bottleneck for superfluid sound that connects $D_\perp$ to c_2 and vice-versa.

In addition to this observation, holography suggests that there exists a universal velocity, v_{IR}^2 in the infrared which provides a lower bound on diffusion, $(4\pi T)D_\perp \gtrsim v_{IR}^2$ [69]. In isotropic holographic models with translation invariance, $\eta = s/4\pi$ [70]. For phases discussed in the main text that have $\rho_n \sim c_{IR}^{-2}(sT) \lesssim sT$ we find

$$D_\perp \simeq c_{IR}^2/(4\pi T). \tag{41}$$

This agrees with [71] where $v_B = c_{IR}$. On the other hand, for phases in which $\rho_n^{(0)} \neq 0$, we find

$$D_\perp \simeq \frac{s}{4\pi\mu\rho_n^{(0)}}. \tag{42}$$

Appendix B: Details of the holographic model

The holographic action

$$S = \int d^{d+2}x\sqrt{-g}\left[R - \frac{Z(\phi)}{4}F^2 - |D\eta|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - V(\phi,|\eta|) - \frac{Y(\phi)}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{d}(\partial\psi_i)^2\right]. \tag{43}$$

gives the following field equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 =& G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{Z}{2}F_{\mu\lambda}F^{\lambda}{}_{\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi - \frac{Y}{2}\partial_\mu\psi_I\partial_\nu\psi_I - (D_\mu\eta)(D_\nu\eta)^* \\
&+ \frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}(\partial\psi)^2 + |D\eta|^2 + V + \frac{Z}{4}F^2 + \frac{Y}{2}\left(\partial\psi_I\right)^2\right] \\
0 =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_\mu(\sqrt{-g}\partial^\mu\phi) - \frac{1}{4}\partial_\phi Z F^2 + \partial_\phi V + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\phi Y(\partial\psi_I)^2 \\
0 =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_\mu(\sqrt{-g}ZF^{\mu\nu}) - 2q^2\eta^2A^\nu \\
0 =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_\mu(\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\nu}D_\nu\eta) + iq(D_\nu\eta)A^\nu - \partial_{\eta^*}V \\
0 =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_\mu[\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\nu}(D_\nu\eta)^*] + iq(D_\nu\eta)^*A^\nu - \partial_\eta V \\
0 =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_\mu\left(\sqrt{-g}Y\partial^\mu\psi_I\right)
\end{aligned}
\tag{44}
$$

where $G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor.

We use the following ansatz for the metric and matter fields consistent with the staticity and rotational symmetry,

$$
\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= -D(r)dt^2 + B(r)dr^2 + C(r)(dx^2+dy^2), \\
A &= A_t dt, \;\; \phi = \phi(r), \;\; |\eta| = \eta(r), \;\; \psi_I = mx^j\delta_{Ij}
\end{aligned}
\tag{45}
$$

which gives the equations of motion

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 =& \frac{d}{dr}\left[C\sqrt{\frac{D}{B}}\eta'\right] + q^2C\sqrt{\frac{B}{D}}A_t^2\eta - \frac{1}{2}C\sqrt{BD}\partial_\eta V \\
0 =& \frac{d}{dr}\left[C\sqrt{\frac{D}{B}}\phi'\right] + \partial_\phi Z\frac{C}{2\sqrt{BD}}(A_t')^2 - m^2\sqrt{BD}\partial_\phi Y - C\sqrt{BD}\partial_\phi V \\
0 =& \frac{d}{dr}\left[Z\frac{C}{\sqrt{BD}}A_t'\right] - 2q^2C\sqrt{\frac{B}{D}}\eta^2A_t \\
0 =& \left(\frac{C}{\sqrt{BD}}D'\right)' + C\sqrt{BD}V - \frac{CZ(A_t')^2}{2\sqrt{BD}} - 2q^2C\sqrt{\frac{B}{D}}\eta^2A_t^2 \\
0 =& (\frac{C'}{\sqrt{BCD}})' + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{C}{BD}}(\phi')^2 + \sqrt{\frac{C}{BD}}(\eta')^2 + q^2\frac{BC}{D^{3/2}}\eta^2A_t^2 \\
0 =& (\phi')^2 + 2(\eta')^2 - \frac{C'}{C}\left(2\frac{D'}{D} + \frac{C'}{C}\right) - Z\frac{(A_t')^2}{D} - 2BV + 2q^2\frac{B}{D}\eta^2A_t^2
\end{aligned}
\tag{46}
$$

The scalar ψ_I equations are trivially satisfied by our ansatz.

From these equations, we defined the flux from the black hole horizon as

$$
\rho_{in} \equiv -Z\frac{C}{\sqrt{BD}}A_t'\Big|_{r=r_h}
\tag{47}
$$

where $r = r_h$ is the radial location of the black hole horizon. When $\lim_{T\to 0} \rho_{in} \equiv \rho_{in}^{(0)} = 0$, we are in a cohesive phase and when $\rho_{in}^{(0)} \neq 0$, we are in a fractionalized phase.

The equations can be combined to the simple equation

$$\frac{d}{dr}\left[\frac{C^2}{\sqrt{BD}}\left(\frac{D}{C}\right)' - \frac{ZC}{\sqrt{BD}}A_t' A_t\right] = m^2\sqrt{BD}Y. \tag{48}$$

which is seen to be conserved for $m = 0$. The term inside the square brackets gives $(-sT)$ when evaluated on the horizon.

In the UV ($r \to 0$), we require that the metric functions and matter fields have an expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(r) &= \mu - \rho\, r + ... \\
\phi(r) &= \phi_s\, r + \phi^{(2)} r^2 + ... \\
\eta(r) &= \eta^{(1)} r + \frac{\langle O_2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} r^2 + ... \\
D(r) &= r^{-2} - \frac{2m^2 + \psi_1^2}{8} - \frac{\langle\epsilon\rangle}{3}\, r + ... \\
C(r) &= r^{-2} + \frac{2m^2 - \psi_1^2}{8} - \frac{\langle P\rangle}{3}\, r + ... \\
B(r) &= r^{-2} + ...
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Here, $\eta^{(1)}$ is a source for the complex scalar. When $\eta^{(1)} = 0$ and $\langle O_2\rangle \neq 0$, the $U(1)$ symmetry is spontaneously broken. The factor of $\sqrt{2}$ is a normalization convention [34]. Next , ϕ_s is a source term for the dilaton which we can use to vary the condensation temperature T_c and drive a phase transition between fractionalized and cohesive phases. Notably, sourcing ϕ breaks conformal invariance as reflected in the trace of the stress tensor. When the asymptotics are inserted into the conservation equation (48), we derive the Smarr relation,

$$\epsilon + P = \mu\rho + Ts. \tag{50}$$

Inserting this expansion into the equations of motion gives

$$P = \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \left(\frac{\eta^{(1)}\langle O_2\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{2}\phi_s\psi^{(2)}\right). \tag{51}$$

Variation of this pressure shows that $\eta^{(1)} = 0$ means the superfluid velocity is not sourced. The ϵ that appears here is the true energy density, rather than the normal energy density ϵ_n. The two are related by $\epsilon = \epsilon_n + \mu\rho_s$.

Appendix C: Holographic computation of the conductivity and of the normal and superfluid densities

The conductivity is obtained by sourcing a fluctuating spatial component of the gauge field, $\delta a_x = a_x(r)e^{-i\omega t}$. For $m = 0$, this requires sourcing $\delta g_{tx} = g_{tx}(r)e^{-i\omega t}$ and for $m \neq 0$ we must also source $\delta g_{xr} = g_{xr}(r)e^{-i\omega t}$ and a fluctuation in $\psi_x = \psi_x + \delta\psi_x e^{-i\omega t}$, see for instance [36]. For ease of reading, we will only write the translation invariant equations. Defining $F = Z\sqrt{\frac{D}{B}}$,

$$0 = \frac{d}{dr}\left[Fa_x'\right] - \frac{Z}{F}\left(2q^2 D\eta^2 - \omega^2 Z + \frac{F^2(A_t')^2}{D}\right)a_x \tag{52}$$

$$0 = \frac{d}{dr}\left[\frac{g_{tx}}{C}\right] + \frac{Z}{C}a_x A_t' \tag{53}$$

In the UV, the fluctuations behave as,

$$\begin{aligned} a_x(r) &= a_x^{(0)} + a_x^{(1)} r + ... \\ g_{tx}(r) &= r^{-2} g_{tx}^{(0)} - \frac{\langle T_{tx}\rangle}{3} r + ... \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

The applied electric field is $F_{xt} = i\omega a_x^{(0)}$ and if we do not apply a temperature gradient $g_{tx}^{(0)} = 0$. The frequency-dependent conductivity is, following the holographic renormalization procedure [34, 72],

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{a_x^{(1)}}{i\omega a_x^{(0)}}. \tag{55}$$

We are interested in extracting the normal and superfluid charge densities, which can be read off from the low frequency behavior of the ac conductivity through (36) and (37). As we now explain, they can be computed more simply by solving the $\omega = 0$ limit of (52).

This equation has two independent solutions, one regular at the horizon and another which is singular there, given by the Wronskian. At low frequencies, a matching argument shows that the singular solution does not contribute to the imaginary part of the conductivity [73]:

$$a_x(r) = a_x^{(reg)}(r) + i\omega Z(\phi(r_h))\left(a_x^{(reg)}(r_h)\right)^2 \frac{a_x^{(sing)}(r)}{a_x^{(0)}}\,. \tag{56}$$

Thus, it is enough to compute $a_x^{(reg)}$ to read off the weight of the imaginary pole of the conductivity, which together with the relation $\rho = \rho_n + \rho_s$, gives access to both the normal and superfluid densities.

At zero temperature, the fluctuation equations reduce to imply that $a_x^{(reg)} = \frac{a_x^{(0)}}{\mu} A_t$, where A_t is the background solution for the gauge field. Plugging into (56), this gives

$$\lim_{\omega \to 0} \mathrm{Im}[\sigma(\omega)] = \frac{\rho}{\mu} \tag{57}$$

as expected.

Furthermore, the constraint equation (53) reads

$$\langle T_{tx} \rangle = -\rho a_x^{(0)} \tag{58}$$

Gauge invariance allows us to trade $a_x^{(0)} \leftrightarrow \xi_x$ and inspecting (23), we find that this equation requires $\delta u^x = \xi^x/\mu$ at $T = 0$ which is consistent with our discussion of the static susceptibility matrix.

Appendix D: ϕ_s/μ as a proxy for doping

In the main text, we stated that ϕ_s/μ could be used as a proxy for doping. We justify this in the following way. By varying ϕ_s/μ, a UV quantity, we approach two quantum critical points in the IR at values ϕ_s^* and ϕ_s^c, while we simultaneously change the critical temperature for superfluidity, as indicated in Figure 3 of the main text. In addition to this behavior, increasing ϕ_s/μ simultaneously increases the total charge density at zero temperature, $\rho_T^{(0)}$ and enhances the scattering rate $\Gamma = m^2 s Y(r_h)/(4\pi[\mu\rho_n + sT])$. We illustrate this in the following plots. This qualitatively behaves analogous to doping in the cuprates.




Figure 4. The total charge density as a function of doping with a superfluid (left) and without a superfluid (center). The scattering rate as a function of doping (right).

* blaise.gouteraux@polytechnique.edu

† eric.mefford@polytechnique.edu

[1] L. Landau, "Theory of the superfluidity of helium ii," Phys. Rev. **60**, 356–358 (1941).

[2] Laszlo Tisza, "The theory of liquid helium," Phys. Rev. **72**, 838–854 (1947).

[3] I.M. Khalatnikov and V.V. Lebedev, "Relativistic hydrodynamics of a superfluid liquid," Physics Letters A **91**, 70 – 72 (1982).

[4] V.V. Lebedev and I.M. Khalatnikov, "Relativistic hydrodynamics of a superfluid liquid," Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **56** (1982).

[5] B. Carter and I. M. Khalatnikov, "Equivalence of convective and potential variational derivations of covariant superfluid dynamics," Phys. Rev. D **45**, 4536–4544 (1992).

[6] B Carter and I.M Khalatnikov, "Momentum, vorticity, and helicity in covariant superfluid dynamics," Annals of Physics **219**, 243 – 265 (1992).

[7] W. Israel, "Covariant superfluid mechanics," Physics Letters A **86**, 79 – 81 (1981).

[8] W. Israel, "Equivalence of two theories of relativistic superfluid mechanics," Physics Letters A **92**, 77 – 78 (1982).

[9] Brandon Carter and David Langlois, "The Equation of state for cool relativistic two constituent superfluid dynamics," Phys. Rev. **D51**, 5855–5864 (1995), arXiv:hep-th/9507058 [hep-th].

[10] Anthony James Leggett, *Quantum liquids: Bose condensation and Cooper pairing in condensed-matter systems* (Oxford university press, 2006).

[11] A J Leggett, "On the Superfluid Fraction of an Arbitrary Many-Body System at T = 0," Journal of Statistical Physics **93**, 927–941 (1998).

[12] I Božović, X He, J Wu, and A T Bollinger, "Dependence of the critical temperature in overdoped copper oxides on superfluid density," Nature **536**, 309–311 (2016).

[13] Jan Zaanen, "Superconducting electrons go missing," Nature **536**, 282–283 (2016).

[14] Steven A. Kivelson, "On the character of the superconductor to metal transition in overdoped cuprates," Journal Club for Condensed Matter Physics (2016), 10.36471/JCCM_August_2016_01.

[15] Fahad Mahmood, Xi He, Ivan Božović, and N. P. Armitage, "Locating the missing superconducting electrons in the overdoped cuprates $la_{2-x}sr_xcuo_4$," Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 027003 (2019), arXiv:1802.02101 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[16] N. R. Lee-Hone, J. S. Dodge, and D. M. Broun, "Disorder and superfluid density in overdoped cuprate superconductors," Phys. Rev. B **96**, 024501 (2017), arXiv:1704.04803 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[17] N. R. Lee-Hone, V. Mishra, D. M. Broun, and P. J. Hirschfeld, "Optical conductivity of overdoped cuprate superconductors: Application to $la_{2-x}sr_xcuo_4$," Phys. Rev. B **98**, 054506 (2018), arXiv:1802.10198 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[18] N. R. Lee-Hone, H. U. Özdemir, V. Mishra, D. M. Broun, and P. J. Hirschfeld, "From Mott to not: phenomenology of overdoped cuprates," (2019), arXiv:1902.08286 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[19] I. Božović, X. He, J. Wu, and A. T. Bollinger, "The vanishing superfluid density in cuprates—and why it matters," Journal of Superconductivity and Novel Magnetism **31**, 2683–2690 (2018).

[20] I. Božović, A. T. Bollinger, J. Wu, and X. He, "Can high-tc superconductivity in cuprates be explained by the conventional bcs theory?" Low Temperature Physics **44**, 519–527 (2018), https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5037554.

[21] D. T. Son, "Low-energy quantum effective action for relativistic superfluids," (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0204199 [hep-ph].

[22] Alberto Nicolis, "Low-energy effective field theory for finite-temperature relativistic superfluids," (2011), arXiv:1108.2513 [hep-th].

[23] Luca V. Delacrétaz, Diego M. Hofman, and Grégoire Mathys, "Superfluids as Higher-form Anomalies," SciPost Phys. **8**, 047 (2020), arXiv:1908.06977 [hep-th].

[24] C. P. Herzog, P. K. Kovtun, and D. T. Son, "Holographic model of superfluidity," Phys. Rev. **D79**, 066002 (2009), arXiv:0809.4870 [hep-th].

[25] Manuel A. Valle, "Hydrodynamic fluctuations in relativistic superfluids," Phys. Rev. **D77**, 025004 (2008), arXiv:0707.2665 [hep-ph].

[26] Leo P Kadanoff and Paul C Martin, "Hydrodynamic equations and correlation functions," Annals of Physics **24**, 419 – 469 (1963).

[27] Pavel Kovtun, "Lectures on hydrodynamic fluctuations in relativistic theories," *INT Summer School on Applications of String Theory Seattle, Washington, USA, July 18-29, 2011*, J. Phys. **A45**, 473001 (2012), arXiv:1205.5040 [hep-th].

[28] Juan Martin Maldacena, "The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity," Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 1113–1133 (1999), [Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.2,231(1998)], arXiv:hep-th/9711200 [hep-th].

[29] Edward Witten, "Anti-de Sitter space and holography," Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253–291 (1998), arXiv:hep-th/9802150 [hep-th].

[30] Sean A. Hartnoll, Andrew Lucas, and Subir Sachdev, "Holographic quantum matter," (2016), arXiv:1612.07324 [hep-th].

[31] Christos Charmousis, Blaise Goutéraux, Bom Soo Kim, Elias Kiritsis, and Rene Meyer, "Effective Holographic Theories for low-temperature condensed matter systems," JHEP **11**, 151 (2010), arXiv:1005.4690 [hep-th].

[32] Richard A. Davison, Simon A. Gentle, and Blaise Goutéraux, "Impact of irrelevant deformations on thermodynamics and transport in holographic quantum critical states," Phys. Rev. **D100**, 086020 (2019), arXiv:1812.11060 [hep-th].

[33] Alexander Adam, Benedict Crampton, Julian Sonner, and Benjamin Withers, "Bosonic Fractionalisation Transitions," JHEP **01**, 127 (2013), arXiv:1208.3199 [hep-th].

[34] Sean A. Hartnoll, Christopher P. Herzog, and Gary T. Horowitz, "Holographic Superconductors," JHEP **12**, 015 (2008), arXiv:0810.1563 [hep-th].

[35] Sean A. Hartnoll, Christopher P. Herzog, and Gary T. Horowitz, "Building a Holographic Superconductor," Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 031601 (2008), arXiv:0803.3295 [hep-th].

[36] Tomas Andrade and Benjamin Withers, "A simple holographic model of momentum relaxation," JHEP **05**, 101 (2014), arXiv:1311.5157 [hep-th].

[37] Christopher P. Herzog and Amos Yarom, "Sound modes in holographic superfluids," Phys. Rev. **D80**, 106002 (2009), arXiv:0906.4810 [hep-th].

[38] Julian Sonner and Benjamin Withers, "A gravity derivation of the Tisza-Landau Model in AdS/CFT," Phys. Rev. **D82**, 026001 (2010), arXiv:1004.2707 [hep-th].

[39] Christopher P. Herzog, Nir Lisker, Piotr Surowka, and Amos Yarom, "Transport in holographic superfluids," JHEP **08**, 052 (2011), arXiv:1101.3330 [hep-th].

[40] Jyotirmoy Bhattacharya, Sayantani Bhattacharyya, and Shiraz Minwalla, "Dissipative Superfluid dynamics from gravity," JHEP **04**, 125 (2011), arXiv:1101.3332 [hep-th].

[41] Jyotirmoy Bhattacharya, Sayantani Bhattacharyya, Shiraz Minwalla, and Amos Yarom, "A Theory of first order dissipative superfluid dynamics," JHEP **05**, 147 (2014), arXiv:1105.3733 [hep-th].

[42] Steven S. Gubser, "Breaking an Abelian gauge symmetry near a black hole horizon," Phys. Rev. **D78**, 065034 (2008), arXiv:0801.2977 [hep-th].

[43] Steven S. Gubser and Abhinav Nellore, "Ground states of holographic superconductors," Phys. Rev. **D80**, 105007 (2009), arXiv:0908.1972 [hep-th].

[44] Gary T. Horowitz and Matthew M. Roberts, "Zero Temperature Limit of Holographic Superconductors," JHEP **11**, 015 (2009), arXiv:0908.3677 [hep-th].

[45] B. Goutéraux and E. Kiritsis, "Quantum critical lines in holographic phases with (un)broken symmetry," JHEP **04**, 053 (2013), arXiv:1212.2625 [hep-th].

[46] B. Goutéraux, "Charge transport in holography with momentum dissipation," JHEP **04**, 181 (2014), arXiv:1401.5436 [hep-th].

[47] Blaise Goutéraux and Eric Mefford, "Temperature dependence of normal and superfluid densities in clean, quantum critical holographic superfluids," to appear.

[48] Sean A. Hartnoll, "Horizons, holography and condensed matter," in *Black holes in higher dimensions*, edited by Gary T. Horowitz (2012) pp. 387–419, arXiv:1106.4324 [hep-th].

[49] Sean A. Hartnoll and Liza Huijse, "Fractionalization of holographic Fermi surfaces," Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 194001 (2012), arXiv:1111.2606 [hep-th].

[50] Alexander Altland and Ben D. Simons, *Condensed Matter Field Theory*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[51] Andreas Schmitt, "Introduction to Superfluidity," Lect. Notes Phys. **888**, pp.1–155 (2015), arXiv:1404.1284 [hep-ph].

[52] Mike Blake and Aristomenis Donos, "Diffusion and Chaos from near AdS_2 horizons," JHEP **02**, 013 (2017), arXiv:1611.09380 [hep-th].

[53] Richard A. Davison, Simon A. Gentle, and Blaise Goutéraux, "Slow relaxation and diffusion in holographic quantum critical phases," Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 141601 (2019), arXiv:1808.05659 [hep-th].

[54] Aristomenis Donos and Jerome P. Gauntlett, "Holographic Q-lattices," JHEP **04**, 040 (2014), arXiv:1311.3292 [hep-th].

[55] Yi Ling, Peng Liu, Chao Niu, Jian-Pin Wu, and Zhuo-Yu Xian, "Holographic Superconductor on Q-lattice," JHEP **02**, 059 (2015), arXiv:1410.6761 [hep-th].

[56] Tomas Andrade and Simon A. Gentle, "Relaxed superconductors," JHEP **06**, 140 (2015), arXiv:1412.6521 [hep-th].

[57] Keun-Young Kim, Kyung Kiu Kim, and Miok Park, "A Simple Holographic Superconductor with Momentum Relaxation," JHEP **04**, 152 (2015), arXiv:1501.00446 [hep-th].

[58] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics (Second Edition)*, second edition ed., edited by L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz (Pergamon, 1987).

[59] Amos Yarom, "Fourth sound of holographic superfluids," JHEP **07**, 070 (2009), arXiv:0903.1353 [hep-th].

[60] Richard A. Davison, Luca V. Delacrétaz, Blaise Goutéraux, and Sean A. Hartnoll, "Hydrodynamic theory of quantum fluctuating superconductivity," Phys. Rev. **B94**, 054502 (2016), [Erratum: Phys. Rev.B96,no.5,059902(2017)], arXiv:1602.08171 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[61] Yue Wang, Jing Yan, Lei Shan, Hai-Hu Wen, Yoichi Tanabe, Tadashi Adachi, and Yoji Koike, "Weak-coupling d-wave bcs superconductivity and unpaired electrons in overdoped $la_{2-x}sr_xCuo_4$ single crystals," Phys. Rev. B **76**, 064512 (2007), arXiv:cond-mat/0703463 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[62] Hai-Hu Wen, Zhi-Yong Liu, Fang Zhou, Jiwu Xiong, Wenxing Ti, Tao Xiang, Seiki Komiya, Xuefeng Sun, and Yoichi Ando, "Electronic specific heat and low-energy quasiparticle excitations in the superconducting state of $la_{2-x}sr_xCuo_4$ single crystals," Phys. Rev. B **70**, 214505 (2004), arXiv:cond-mat/0406741 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[63] N. E. Hussey, R. A. Cooper, Xiaofeng Xu, Y. Wang, B. Vignolle, and C. Proust, "Dichotomy in the T-linear resistivity in hole-doped cuprates," (2009), arXiv:0912.2001 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[64] S. Badoux, W. Tabis, F. Laliberté, G. Grissonnanche, B. Vignolle, D. Vignolles, J. Béard, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, R. Liang, N. Doiron-Leyraud, Louis Taillefer, and Cyril Proust, "Change of carrier density at the pseudogap critical point of a cuprate superconductor," Nature (London) **531**, 210–214 (2016), arXiv:1511.08162 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[65] Carsten Putzke, Siham Benhabib, Wojciech Tabis, Jake Ayres, Zhaosheng Wang, Liam Malone, Salvatore Licciardello, Jianming Lu, Takeshi Kondo, Tsunehiro Takeuchi, Nigel E. Hussey, John R. Cooper, and Antony Carrington, "Reduced Hall carrier density in the overdoped strange metal regime of cuprate superconductors," (2019), arXiv:1909.08102 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[66] Ar Abanov, Andrey V Chubukov, and Jörg Schmalian, "Quantum-critical theory of the spin-fermion model and its application to cuprates: Normal state analysis," Advances in Physics **52**, 119–218 (2003), arXiv:cond-mat/0107421 [cond-mat.supr-con].

[67] Max A. Metlitski and Subir Sachdev, "Quantum phase transitions of metals in two spatial dimensions: II. Spin density wave order," Phys. Rev. **B82**, 075128 (2010), arXiv:1005.1288 [cond-mat.str-el].

[68] Aavishkar A. Patel and Subir Sachdev, "DC resistivity at the onset of spin density wave order in two-dimensional metals," Phys. Rev. **B90**, 165146 (2014), arXiv:1408.6549 [cond-mat.str-el].

[69] Sean A. Hartnoll, "Theory of universal incoherent metallic transport," Nature Phys. **11**, 54 (2015), arXiv:1405.3651 [cond-mat.str-el].

[70] P. Kovtun, Dan T. Son, and Andrei O. Starinets, "Viscosity in strongly interacting quantum field theories from black hole physics," Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 111601 (2005), arXiv:hep-

th/0405231 [hep-th].

[71] Mike Blake, "Universal Charge Diffusion and the Butterfly Effect in Holographic Theories," Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 091601 (2016), arXiv:1603.08510 [hep-th].

[72] Kostas Skenderis, "Lecture notes on holographic renormalization," *The quantum structure of space-time and the geometric nature of fundamental interactions. Proceedings, RTN European Winter School, RTN 2002, Utrecht, Netherlands, January 17-22, 2002*, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 5849–5876 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0209067 [hep-th].

[73] Richard A. Davison, Blaise Goutéraux, and Sean A. Hartnoll, "Incoherent transport in clean quantum critical metals," JHEP **10**, 112 (2015), arXiv:1507.07137 [hep-th].