Super uidity in Dilute Trapped Bose Gases

Elliott H. Lieb and Robert Seiringer^y

Departm ent of Physics, Jadwin Hall, Princeton University, P.O.Box 708, Princeton, New Jersey 08544

Jakob Yngvason^z

Institut fur Theoretische Physik, Universitat W ien, Boltzm anngasse 5, A-1090 V ienna, Austria

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

A commonly used theoretical de nition of super uidity in the ground state of a Bose gas is based on the response of the system to an imposed velocity eld or, equivalently, to twisted boundary conditions in a box. We are able to carry out this program in the case of a dilute interacting Bose gas in a trap, and we prove that a gas with repulsive interactions is 100% super uid in the dilute lim it in which the Gross-P itaevskii equation is exact. This is the rst example in an experimentally realistic continuum model in which super uidity is rigorously veried.

I. IN TRODUCTION

The phenom enological two-uid model of super uidity (see, e.g., 1) is based on the idea that the particle density

is composed of two parts, the density $_{\rm s}$ of the inviscid super uid and the norm all uid density $_{\rm n}$. If an external velocity eld is imposed on the uid (for instance by m oving the walls of the container) only the viscous norm al component responds to the velocity eld, while the super uid component stays at rest. In accord with these ideas the super uid density in the ground state is offen de ned as follow s²: Let E₀ denote the ground state energy of the system in the rest fram e and E₀⁰ the ground state energy, measured in the moving fram e, when a velocity eld v is imposed. Then for small v

$$\frac{E_0^0}{N} = \frac{E_0}{N} + (s =)\frac{1}{2}mv^2 + O(jv^4)$$
(1)

where N is the particle number and m the particle mass. At positive tem peratures the ground state energy should be replaced by the free energy. (Rem ark: It is in portant here that (1) holds uniform ly for all large N ; i.e., that the error term 0 (jv_{f}^{4}) can be bounded independently of N. For xed N and a nite box, Eq. (1) with s = 1 alwaysholds for a Bose gas with an arbitrary interaction if v is smallenough, ow ing to the discreteness of the energy spectrum³.) There are other de nitions of the super uid density that m ay lead to slightly di erent results⁴, but this is the one we shall use in this paper. We shall not dwell on this issue here, since it is not clear that there is a \one-size- ts-all" de nition of super uidity. For instance, in the de nition we use here the ideal Bose gas is a perfect super uid in its ground state, whereas the de nition of Landau in term s of a linear dispersion relation of elementary excitations would indicate otherwise. W e em phasize that we are not advocating any particular approach to the super uidity question; our contribution here consists in taking one standard de nition and m aking its consequences explicit.

O ne of the unresolved issues in the theory of super uidity is its relation to Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC). It has been argued that in general neither condition is necessary for the other (c.f., e.g., 5,6,7). A simple example illustrating the fact that BEC is not necessary for super uidity is the 1D hard-core Bose gas. This system is well known to have a spectrum like that of an ideal Ferm i gas³, and it is easy to see that it is super uid in its ground state in the sense of (1). On the other hand, it has no BEC 9,10 . The de nition of the super uid velocity as the gradient of the phase of the condensate wave function^{2,11} is clearly not applicable in such cases.

We do not give a historical overview of super uidity because excellent review articles are available^{11,12}. W hile the early investigations of super uidity and Bose-Einstein condensation were mostly concerned with liquid Helium 4, it has become possible in recent years to study these phenomena in dilute trapped gases of alkali atom s¹³. The experimental success in realizing BEC in such gases has led to a large number of theoretical papers on this subject. Most of these works take BEC for granted and start o with the Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) equation to describe the condensate wave function. A rigorous justi cation of these assumptions is however a di cult task, and only very recently BEC has been rigorously proved for a physically realistic many-body Ham iltonian¹⁴. It is clearly of interest to show that super uidity also holds in thism odel and this is what we accom plish here. W e prove that the ground state of a Bose gas with short range, repulsive interaction is 100% super uid in the dilute lim it in which the Gross-Pitaevskii description of the gas is exact. This is the lim it in which the particle num ber tends to in nity, but the ratio N a=L, where a is the scattering length of the interaction potential and L the box size, is kept xed. (The signi cance of the param eter N a=L is that it is the ratio of the ground state energy per particle, $N = L^3$, to the lowest excitation energy in the box, $1=L^2$.) In addition we show that the gas remains 100% Bose-Einstein condensed in this limit, also for a nite velocity v. Both results can be generalized from periodic boxes to (non-constant) velocity elds in a cylindrical geometry.

The results of this paper have been conjectured for m any years, and it is gratifying that they can be proved from rst principles. They represent the rst example of a rigorous veri cation of super uidity in an experimentally realistic continuum model.

W e wish to emphasize that in this GP limit the fact that there is 100% condensation does not mean that no signi cant interactions occur. The kinetic and potential energies can di erm arkedly from that obtained with a simple variational function that is an N -fold product of one-body condensate wave functions. This assertion might seem paradoxical, and the explanation is that near the GP limit the region in which the wave function di ers from the condensate function has a tiny volum e that goes to zero as N ! 1 . N evertheless, the interaction energy, which is proportional to N, resides in this tiny volum e.

II. SETTING AND MAIN RESULTS

W e consider a Bose gas with the Ham iltonian

$$H_{N} = \sum_{j=1}^{X^{N}} r_{j}^{2} + \sum_{1 \le j N} v(jr_{1} r_{j}); \quad (2)$$

where = \sim^2 =(2m) and the interaction potential v is nonnegative and of nite range. The two-body scattering length of v is denoted by a. The Ham iltonian acts on totally symmetric functions of N variables $r_i = (x_i; y_i; z_i) 2 K R^3$, where K denotes the cube $[0; L]^3$ of side length L. (W e could easily use a cuboid of sides $L_1; L_2; L_3$ instead.) W e assume periodic boundary conditions in all three coordinate directions.

Imposing an external velocity eld v = (0;0; jv)m eans that the momentum operator p = i r is replaced by by p m v, retaining the periodic boundary conditions. The H am iltonian in the moving fram e is thus

$$H_{N}^{0} = r_{j} + i' = L^{2} + X \quad v(jr_{i} \quad r_{j});$$

$$j=1 \qquad 1 \quad i < j \quad N \quad (3)$$

where ' = (0;0;') and the dimensionless phase ' is connected to the velocity v by

$$' = \frac{jrjm}{\sim} : \qquad (4)$$

Let E_0 (N ;a;') denote the ground state energy of (3) with periodic boundary conditions. Obviously it is no restriction to consider only the case ', since E_0 is periodic in ' with period 2. For $_0$ the ground state of H_N^0 , let $_N$ be its one-particle reduced density matrix

$$Z_{N}(\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r}^{0}) = N_{K^{N-1}} (\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r}_{2};\ldots;\mathbf{r}_{N})_{0} (\mathbf{r}^{0};\mathbf{r}_{2};\ldots;\mathbf{r}_{N}) d\mathbf{r}_{2} N d\mathbf{r}$$
(5)

We are interested in the Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) limit N ! 1 with Na=L xed. We also x the box size

L. This means that a should vary like 1=N which can be achieved by writing $v(r) = a^{-2}v_1$ (r=a), where v_1 is a xed potential with scattering length 1, while a changes with N.

Theorem 1 (Super uidity of hom ogeneous gas). For j j

$$\lim_{N ! 1} \frac{E_0 (N;a;')}{N} = 4 \quad a + \frac{'^2}{L^2}$$
(6)

in the limit N ! 1 with N a=L and L xed. Here = $N = L^3$, so a is xed too. In the same limit, for j' j < r,

$$\lim_{N \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{N} |_{N} (r; r^{0}) = \frac{1}{L^{3}}$$
(7)

in trace class norm, i.e., $\lim_{N \ge 1} \operatorname{Trace}_{N} = \mathbb{N}$ i $^{3=2}$ ih $^{3=2}$ j = 0.

Note that, by the de nition (1) of $_{\rm s}$ and Eq. (4), Eq. (6) means that $_{\rm s}$ = , i.e., there is 100% super uidity. For ' = 0, Eq. (6) was rst proved in¹⁵. Eq. (7) for ' = 0 is the BEC proved in¹⁴.

Remarks. 1. By a unitary gauge transform ation,

U
$$(r_1; :::; r_N) = e^{i' \prod_{i=1}^{P} z_i) = L} (r_1; :::; r_N);$$
 (8)

the passage from (2) to (3) is equivalent to replacing periodic boundary conditions in a box by the twisted boundary condition

$$(r_1 + (0;0;L);r_2;...;r_N) = e^{i'} (r_1;r_2;...;r_N)$$
 (9)

in the direction of the velocity eld, while retaining the original H am iltionian (2).

2. The criterion j'j m eans that $jvj \sim=(m L)$. The corresponding energy $\frac{1}{2}m$ ($\sim=(m L))^2$ is the gap in the excitation spectrum of the one-particle H am iltonian in the nite-size system.

3. The reason that we have to restrict ourselves to j' j < in the second part of Theorem 1 is that for j' j = there are two ground states of the operator $(r + i' = L)^2$ with periodic boundary conditions. A llwe can say in this case is that there is a subsequence of _N that converges to a density matrix of rank 2, whose range is spanned by these two functions.

Theorem 1 can be generalized in various ways to a physically more realistic setting. As an example, let C be a nite cylinder based on an annulus centered at the origin. G iven a bounded, real function a (r; z) let A be the vector eld (in polar coordinates) A (r; ;z) = 'a(r;z)b, where b is the unit vector in the direction. We also allow for a bounded external potential V (r; z) that does not depend on .

U sing the m ethods of Appendix A in¹⁶, it is not di – cult to see that there exists a $\prime_0 > 0$, depending only on

C and a (r;z), such that for all j j< $'_0$ there is a unique m inim izer ^{GP} of the G ross-P itaevskii functional

$$E^{GP}[] = r + iA(r) (r)^{2}$$

$$+ V(r)j(r)^{2} + 4 Naj(r)^{4} d^{3}r (10)$$

under the norm alization condition j = 1. This minimizer does not depend on , and can be chosen to be positive, for the following reason: The relevant term in the kinetic energy is $T = r^2 [0=0 + i' \operatorname{ra}(r;z)\hat{f}]$. If $j \operatorname{ra}(r;z)j < 1=2$, it is easy to see that $T - i^2 \operatorname{a}(r;z)^2$, in which case, without raising the energy, we can replace by the square root of the -average of j = 1. This can only lower the kinetic energy¹⁷ and, by convexity of $x \leq x^2$, this also lowers the i^4 term.

W e denote the ground state energy of E $^{G\,P}$ by E $^{G\,P}$, depending on N a and \prime . The following Theorem 2 concerns the ground state energy E $_0$ of

$$H_{N}^{A} = \begin{array}{c} X^{N} h & i \\ r_{j} + iA (r_{j})^{2} + V (r_{j}) \\ j=1 & X \\ + & v (jr_{i} r_{j}); \quad (11) \\ 1 & i < j N \end{array}$$

with Neumann boundary conditions on C, and the one-particle reduced density matrix $_{\rm N}$ of the ground state, respectively. Dierent boundary conditions can be treated in the same manner, if they are also used in (10).

Rem ark. As a special case, consider a uniform ly rotating system . In this case A (r) = ' rb , where 2' is the angular velocity. H $_{\rm N}^{\rm A}$ is the H am iltonian in the rotating frame, but with external potential V (r) + A (r)^2 (see e.g. ^{11} (p. 131)).

Theorem 2 (Super uidity in a cylinder). For j j< ' $_{\rm 0}$

$$\lim_{N ! 1} \frac{E_0 (N;a;')}{N} = E^{GP} (Na;')$$
(12)

in the lim it N ! 1 with N a xed. In the same lim it,

$$\lim_{N \stackrel{!}{=} 1} \frac{1}{N} |_{N} (r; r^{0}) = {}^{GP} (r) {}^{GP} (r^{0})$$
(13)

in trace class norm, i.e., $\lim_{N \ge 1} \operatorname{Trace}_{N} = \mathbb{N}$ j^{GP} ih $^{GP}j = 0$.

In the case of a uniform ly rotating system, where 2' is the angular velocity, the condition $j \leq '_0$ in particular means that the angular velocity is smaller than the critical velocity for creating vortices¹⁸.

Rem ark. In the special case of the curl-free vector potential A (r;) = 'r ¹b , i.e., a (r; z) = r ¹, one can say m ore about the role of '0. In this case, there is a unique G P m inim izer for all ' \mathfrak{B} Z + $\frac{1}{2}$, whereas there are two m inim izers for '2 Z + $\frac{1}{2}$. Part two of T heorem 2 holds in this special case for all ' \mathfrak{B} Z + $\frac{1}{2}$, and (12) is true even for all '.

III. PROOFS

In the following, we will present only a proof of Theorem 1 for simplicity. Theorem 2 can be proved using the same m ethods, and additionally the m ethods of d^4 to deal with the inhom ogeneity of the system.

Before giving the form al proofs, we outline the main ideas. The strategy is related to the one in^{14} , but requires substantial generalizations of the techniques. A crucial element of the proof, stated in Lemma 1 below, is the fact that the interaction energy can be localized in small balls around each particle. This part uses a Lemma of D yson¹⁹, and its generalization in^{15} , which converts a strong short range potential into a soft potential. This Lemma can be also be applied to the case of an external velocity eld, i.e., a U (1) gauge eld in the kinetic term of the H am iltonian, owing to the \diam agnetic inequality"¹⁷. This inequality says that the additional gauge eld increases the kinetic energy density.

The second m ain part of the proof is the generalized Poincare inequality given in Lemma 2. We recall that an essential ingredient of the proof of Bose-E instein condensation in¹⁴ was showing that the fact that the kinetic energy density is small in most of the con guration space in plies that the one-body reduced density matrix is essentially constant. The diculty comes from the fact that the region in which the kinetic energy is small. can, in principle, be broken up into disjoint subregions, thereby permitting di erent constants in di erent subregions. The fact that this does not happen is the content of the generalized Poincare inequality. In the present case we have an additional com plication com ing from the im posed gauge eld. The old Poincare inequality does not su ce; one now has to measure the kinetic energy density relative to the lowest energy of a free particle in the gauge eld rather than to zero. This is an essential com plication. W hile the previous (generalized) Poincare inequality could, after som e argum entation, be related to the standard Poincare inequality¹⁷, this new one, with the gauge eld, requires a totally new proof.

Proof of Theorem 1. As in^{15} we de ne Y = $(4 = 3) a^3$. Note that in the limit considered, Y N². We rst consider the upper bound to E₀. U sing the ground state ₀ for \prime = 0 as a trial function, we immediately get

$$E_0(N;a;') = h_0; H_N^0 = E_0(N;a;0) + N = \frac{r^2}{L^2};$$

(14)

since h_0 ; $r_{i_0}i = 0$. From ¹⁶ we know that E_0 (N; a; 0) 4 N a(1 + const: Y¹⁼³), which has the right form as N ! 1.

For the lower bound to the ground state energy we need the following Lemma.

Lem m a 1 (Localization of energy). For all sym-metric, normalized wave functions $(r_1; :::; r_N)$ with

periodic boundary conditions on K , and for N $\,$ Y $^{1=17}$,

$$\frac{1}{N} h_{Z} H_{N}^{0} i_{Z} = 1 \text{ const:} Y^{1=17} + 4 + dX + dr_{1} r_{1} + i' = L (r_{1}; X)^{2}; (15)$$

where X = $(r_2; :::; r_N)$, dX = $\int_{j=2}^{Q} dr_j$, and

$$x = r_1 : \min_{j 2} jr_1 r_j j R$$
 (16)

with $R = aY^{5=17}$.

Proof. Since is symmetric, the left side of (15) can be written as

For any " > 0 and R > 0 this is

$$T + (1 ")(T^{in} + I) + (1 ")T_{\prime}^{out};$$
 (18)

with

$$T = \int_{K^{N-1}}^{Z} dX dr_{1} r_{1} j (r_{1}; X) j^{2}; \quad (19)$$

$$T^{in} = \begin{array}{ccc} Z & Z \\ dX & dr_{1} r_{1} j (r_{1}; X) j^{2}; \quad (20) \\ & & \\$$

$$T_{,}^{out} = \int_{K^{N-1}}^{Z} dX dr_{1} r_{1} + i' = L (r_{1}; X)^{2};$$
(21)

and

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \int_{K^{N-1}} dX \int_{K} dr_{1} v(jr_{1} r_{j})j(r_{1};X)j^{2}:$$
(22)

Here

$$_{X}^{c} = fr_{1} : jr_{1} r_{j} j < R$$
 for some j 2g (23)

is the com plan ent of $_{\rm X}$, and the diam agnetic inequality j(r + i' = L)f(r)j' jr jf $(r)j^2$ has been used. The proof is completed by using the results of 45 and 14 (see also²⁰) which tell us that for " = Y $^{1=17}$ and R = aY $^{5=17}$

as long as N Y $^{1=17}$. (This estimate is highly non-trivial. Among several other things it uses a generalization of D yson's lemm a¹⁹.)

The following Lemma 2 is needed for a lower bound on the second term in (15). It is stated for K the L L L-cube with periodic boundary conditions, but it can be generalized to arbitrary connected sets K that are su ciently nice so that the R ellich-K ondrashov T heorem (see¹⁷ (T hm . 8.9)) holds on K. In particular, this is the case if K has the bone property¹⁷. Another possible generalization is to include general bounded vector elds replacing ', see²¹.

If is any subset of K we shall denote $\begin{array}{c} R \\ f(r)g(r)dr \end{array}$ by hf;gi and hf;fi¹⁼² by kfk_{L²()}. We also denote r + i' by r, for short.

Lem m a 2 (G eneralized Poincare inequality). For any j' j < there are constants c > 0 and C < 1 such that for all subsets K and all functions f on the torus K the following estimate holds:

$$kr \cdot fk_{L^{2}(\cdot)}^{2} \quad \frac{\prime^{2}}{L^{2}}kfk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} + \frac{c}{L^{2}}kf \quad L^{-3}hl; fi_{K}k_{L^{2}(K)}^{2}$$

$$C \quad kr \cdot fk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} + \frac{1}{L^{2}}kfk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} \quad \frac{jj^{c}}{Kj} \quad \stackrel{1=2}{:} \quad (25)$$

Here j $^{\rm c}$ j is the volume of $^{\rm c}$ = K n , the complement of in K .

Proof. We shall derive (25) from a special form of this inequality that holds for all functions that are orthogonal to the constant function. Namely, for any positive <2=3 and some constants c > 0 and C < 1 (depending only on and j j<) we claim that

$$\frac{kr \cdot hk_{L^{2}(r)}^{2}}{\frac{r^{2} + c}{L^{2}}khk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2}} \quad \mathfrak{E} \quad \frac{j^{c}j}{\mathfrak{K}j} \quad kr \cdot hk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2}; \quad (26)$$

provided h1;hi_K = 0. (Rem ark: Eq. (26) holds also for = 2=3, but the proof is slightly m ore complicated in that case. See²¹.) If (26) is known the derivation of (25) is easy: For any f, the function $h = f L^{3}h1;fi_{K}$ is orthogonal to 1. M oreover,

$$kr \cdot hk_{L^{2}()}^{2} = kr \cdot hk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} kr \cdot hk_{L^{2}(\circ)}^{2}$$

$$= kr \cdot fk_{L^{2}()}^{2} \frac{'^{2}}{L^{2}} jL^{3=2}; fi_{K} j^{2} 1 + \frac{j c j}{K j}$$

$$+ 2\frac{'}{L} RehL^{3=2}; fi_{K} hr \cdot f; L^{3=2} i c$$

$$kr \cdot fk_{L^{2}()}^{2} \frac{'^{2}}{L^{2}} jL^{3=2}; fi_{K} j^{2}$$

$$+ \frac{j j}{L} Lkr \cdot fk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} + \frac{1}{L} kfk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} \frac{j c j}{K j}^{1=2}$$
(27)

and

$$\frac{\prime^{2} + c}{L^{2}} khk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} = \frac{\prime^{2}}{L^{2}} kfk_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} JL^{3=2}; fi_{K} f^{2} + \frac{c}{L^{2}} kf L^{3}hl; fi_{K} k_{L^{2}(K)}^{2} : (28)$$

Setting = $\frac{1}{2}$, using kr $hk_{L^{2}(K)}$ kr $fk_{L^{2}(K)}$ in the last term in (26) and combining (26), (27) and (28) gives (25) with C = $j' j + \mathfrak{E}$.

We now turn to the proof of (26). For simplicity we set L = 1. The general case follows by scaling. A ssume that (26) is false. Then there exist sequences of constants C_n ! 1, functions h_n with kh_nk_{L²(K)} = 1 and hl;h_n i_K = 0, and domains _n K such that

$$\lim_{n! = 1}^{n} kr \cdot h_{n} k_{L^{2}(n)}^{2} + C_{n} j_{n}^{c} j kr \cdot h_{n} k_{L^{2}(K)}^{2}$$
(29)

W e shall show that this leads to a contradiction.

Since the sequence h_n is bounded in L^2 (K) it has a subsequence, denoted again by h_n , that converges weakly to some $h \ 2 \ L^2$ (K) (i.e., $hg;h_n\,i_K \ !$ $hg;hi_K$ for all $g \ 2 \ L^2$ (K)). M oreover, by H older's inequality the L^p (${}_n^c$) nom $kr \cdot h_n\,k_{L^p}({}_{n-1}^c) = ({}_n^c\,h(r)\ fdr)^{1=p}$ is bounded by $j \ c \ j^{=2} kr \cdot h_n\,k_{L^2(K)}$ for $p = 2=(\ + 1)$. From (29) we conclude that $kr \cdot h_n\,k_{L^p}({}_{n-1}^c)$ is bounded and also that $kr \cdot h_n\,k_{L^p}({}_{n-1}^c)$ is bounded. A ltogether, $r \cdot h_n$ is bounded in L^p (K), and by passing to a further subsequence if necessary, we can therefore assume that $r \cdot h_n$ converges weakly in L^p (K). The same applies to $r \ h_n$. Since $p = 2=(\ + 1)$ with < 2=3 the hypotheses of the Rellich-K ondrashov Theorem 17 (Thm 8.9) are fully a start of the set of t

led and consequently h_n converges strongly in L^2 (K) to h (i.e., kh $h_n\,k_{L^{\,2}\,(K)}$! 0). We shall now show that

$$\lim_{n!} \inf_{1} kr \cdot h_n k_{L^2(n)}^2 kr \cdot h_{L^2(K)}^2 : \quad (30)$$

This will complete the proof because the h_n are norm alized and orthogonal to 1 and the same holds for h by strong convergence. Hence the right side of (30) is necessarily > \prime^2 , since for j j < the lowest eigenvalue of r^2 , with constant eigenfunction, is non-degenerate. This contradicts (29).

Eq. (30) is essentially a consequence of the weak lower semicontinuity of the L² norm, but the dependence on $_n$ leads to a slight complication. First, Eq. (29) and C_n ! 1 clearly imply that $j_n^c j$! 0, because kr $h_n k_{L^2(K)}^2 > {'}_p^2$. By choosing a subsequence we may assume that $_n j_n^c j < 1$. For some xed N let $e_N = K n [n_N \frac{c}{n}$. Then $\tilde{}_N n$ for n N. Since kr $h_n k_{L^2(n)}^2$ is bounded, r h_n is also bounded in L² (e_N) and a subsequence of it converges weakly in L² (e_N) to r h. Hence

$$\lim_{n! \ 1} \inf_{n! \ 1} kr \cdot h_n k_{L^2(_n)}^2 \lim_{n! \ 1} \inf_{n! \ 1} kr \cdot h_n k_{L^2(_{N})}^2 \quad kr \cdot h k_{L^2(_{N})}^2 : (31)$$

Since $e_N = e_{N+1}$ and [N = K (up to a set of measure zero), we can now let N ! 1 on the right side of (31). By monotone convergence this converges to kr $\cdot hk_{L^2(K)}^2$. This proves (30) which, as remarked above, contradicts (29).

We now are able to nish the proof of Theorem 1. From Lemm as 1 and 2 we infer that, for any symmetric with h; i = 1 and for N large enough,

$$\frac{1}{N}h; H_{N}^{0} i 1 \text{ const}: Y^{1=17} ^{1}$$

$$4 a + \frac{\prime^{2}}{L^{2}}$$

$$C Y^{1=17} \frac{1}{L^{2}} + \frac{1}{Z^{N}}; \stackrel{P}{}_{j}(r_{j} + i')$$

$$+ \frac{c}{L^{2}} dX dr_{1} (r_{1}; X)$$

$$L^{3} \stackrel{R}{}_{K} dr (r; X) ^{2}; (32)$$

where we used that j ^cj $\frac{4}{3}$ N R³ = const:L³Y²⁼¹⁷. From this we can infer two things. First, since the kinetic energy, divided by N, is certainly bounded independent of N, as the upper bound show s, we get that

$$\lim_{N i = 1} \inf_{n = 1}^{\infty} \frac{E_0(N;a;')}{N} = 4 = a + \frac{r^2}{L^2}$$
(33)

for any j j< . By continuity this holds also for j j= , proving (6). (To be precise, E₀=N $^{\prime 2}L^{2}$ is concave in $^{\prime}$, and therefore stays concave, and in particular continuous, in the lim it N ! 1 .) Secondly, since the upper and the lower bound to E₀ agree in the lim it considered, the positive last term in (32) has to vanish in the lim it. I.e., we get that for the ground state wave function $_{0}$ of H $_{N}^{0}$

This proves (7), since

Z Z

$$dX dr_{1 0}(r_{1};X) L^{3} \frac{R}{K} dr_{0}(r;X)^{2}$$

 $= 1 \frac{1}{N L^{3}} \frac{Z}{K K} (r;r^{0}) dr dr^{0};$ (35)

and therefore N ¹hL ³⁼² j_N jL ³⁼² i ! 1. As explained in ^{14,20} this su ces for the convergence N ¹_N ! jL ³⁼² ihL ³⁼² jin trace class norm.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

W e have shown that a Bose gas with short range, repulsive interactions is both a 100% super uid and also 100% Boæ-E instein condensed in its ground state in the G ross-P itaevskiilim it where the parameter N a=L is kept xed as N ! 1 . This is a simultaneous large N and low density lim it, because the dimensionless density parameter a³ is here proportional to 1=N². If a³ is not zero, but small, a depletion of the Boæ-E instein condensate of the order (a³)¹⁼² is expected (see, e.g.,²²). Nevertheless, complete super uidity in the ground state, e.g. of Helium 4, is experimentally observed. It is an interesting open problem to deduce this property rigorously from rst principles. In the case of a one-dimensional hard-core Bose gas super uidity in the ground state is

E lectronic address: lieb@m ath princeton edu

- ^y On leave from Institut fur Theoretische Physik, Universitat W ien, Boltzm anngasse 5, A-1090 Vienna, Austria; E lectronic address: rseiring@ m ath princeton edu
- ^z E lectronic address: yngvason@ thor.thp.univie.ac.at
- ¹ D R. Tilley and J. Tilley, Super uidity and Superconductivity, third edition, A dam Hilger, Bristol and New York (1990).
- ² P.C. Hohenberg and P.C. Martin, Ann. Phys. (NY) 34, 291 (1965).
- ³ The ground state with v = 0 remains an eigenstate of the H am iltonian with arbitrary v since its totalmomentum is zero. Its energy is $\frac{1}{2}m N v^2$ above the ground state energy for v = 0. Since in a nite box the spectrum of the H am iltonian for arbitrary v is discrete and the energy gap above the ground state is bounded away from zero for v sm all, the ground state for v = 0 is at the same time the ground state of the H am iltonian with v if $\frac{1}{2}m N v^2$ is sm aller than the gap.
- ⁴ N.V. Prokof'ev and B.V. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. B 61, 11282 (2000).
- ⁵ K. Huang, in: Bose-Einstein Condensation, A. Grin, D.W. Stroke, S. Stringari, eds., Cambridge University Press, 31{50 (1995).
- ⁶ G E. Astrakharchik, J. Boronat, J. Casulleras, and S. Giorgini, arX iv cond-m at/0111165 (2001).
- ⁷ M.Kobayashi and M.Tsubota, arX iv cond-m at/0202364 (2002).
- ⁸ M.Girardeau, J.M ath. Phys. 1, 516 (1960).

easy to show, but nevertheless there is no $B \circ x = E$ instein condensation at all, not even in the ground state^{9,10}.

A cknow ledgm ents

E H L. was partially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation grant PHY 98-20650. R.S. was supported by the Austrian Science Fund in the from of an Erw in Schrodinger fellow ship.

- ⁹ A.Lenard, J.M ath. Phys. 5, 930 (1964).
- ¹⁰ L.Pitaevskii and S.Stringari, J.Low Temp.Phys.85, 377 (1991).
- ¹¹ G.Baym, in: Math. Methods in Solid State and Super uid Theory, Scottish Univ. Summer School of Physics, O liver and Boyd, Edinburgh (1969).
- ¹² A J. Leggett, Rev. M od. Phys. 71, S318 (1999).
- ¹³ F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Rev. M od. Phys. 71, 463 (1999).
- ¹⁴ E.H. Lieb and R. Seiringer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 170409 (2002).
- ¹⁵ E.H. Lieb and J. Yngvason, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2504 (1998).
- ¹⁶ E H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, and J. Yngvason, Phys. Rev. A 61, 043602 (2000).
- ¹⁷ E H. Lieb and M. Loss, Analysis, second edition, American M athem atical Society (2001).
- ¹⁸ A L.Fetter and A A. Svidzinsky, J.Phys.: Condens.M atter 13, R135 (2001).
- ¹⁹ F.J.Dyson, Phys. Rev. 106, 317 (1957).
- ²⁰ E.H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, J.P. Solovej and J.Yngvason, to appear in Contemporary Developments in M athematics 2001', International Press. arX iv m ath-ph/0204027 (2002).
- ²¹ E.H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, and J. Yngvason, arXiv: m ath FA /0205088 (2002).
- ²² C J. Pethick and H. Sm ith, Bose-Einstein Condensation in D ilute G ases, C am bridge U niversity Press (2002).