# Four-body problem and BEC-BCS crossover in a quasi-one-dimensional cold fermion gas 

C. Mora, ${ }^{1}$ A. Komnik, ${ }^{2}$ R. Egger, ${ }^{1}$ and A.O. Gogolin ${ }^{3}$<br>${ }^{1}$ Institut für Theoretische Physik, Heinrich-Heine-Universität, D-40225 Düsseldorf, Germany<br>${ }^{2}$ Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany<br>${ }^{3}$ Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London,<br>180 Queen's Gate, London SW7 2BZ, United Kingdom

(Dated: March 23, 2022)


#### Abstract

The four-body problem for an interacting two-species Fermi gas is solved analytically in a confined quasi-one-dimensional geometry, where the two-body atom-atom scattering length $a_{a a}$ displays a confinement-induced resonance. We compute the dimer-dimer scattering length $a_{d d}$, and show that this quantity completely determines the many-body solution of the associated BEC-BCS crossover phenomenon in terms of bosonic dimers.


PACS numbers: 03.75.Ss, 05.30.Fk, 03.65.Nk

Cold atomic quantum gases continue to attract a lot of attention due to their high degree of control, tunability, and versatility. A main topic of interest has been the exploration of the BEC-BCS crossover in fermionic systems [1, 2, 3, 4, [5, 6]. In two or three dimensions, this is still a controversial and not completely settled issue on the theory side [7, $8, ~ 9, ~ 10]$, despite the qualitative agreement between mean-field theories and experimental data. Notably, a similar (but different) crossover phenomenon has been predicted to occur in quasi-one-dimensional (1D) systems 11, 12], where a cylindrical trap leads to a confinement-induced resonance (CIR) 13, 14] in the atom-atom interaction strength, analogous to the magnetically tuned Feshbach resonance [8]. In contrast to what happens in 3 D , one always has a two-body bound state ('dimer') in 1D, regardless of the sign of the 3D atom-atom scattering length $a$. We solve the fermionic four-body problem in the confined geometry, and compute the dimer-dimer scattering length $a_{d d}$ throughout the full BCS-BEC crossover, on each side of the CIR. On the 'BEC' side, we establish contact to results for the unconfined case 15], while on the ' BCS ' side, a simple Bethe Ansatz calculation provides exact results. The three-body problem has no trimer solution [16], and thus the full many-body crossover solution can be expressed in terms of $a_{d d}$ alone and is thereby solved completely in this Letter. Since 1D atomic gases can be prepared and probed thanks to recent advances 17, 18, 19], our predictions could be observed in state-of-the-art experiments.

We assume two fermion hyperfine components (denoted by $\uparrow, \downarrow$ ) with identical particle numbers $N_{\uparrow}=$ $N_{\downarrow}=N / 2$, interacting only via $s$-wave interactions. At low energies, the pseudopotential approximation 20] for the 3D interaction among unlike fermions applies, $V(\mathbf{r})=\left(4 \pi \hbar^{2} a / m_{0}\right) \delta(\mathbf{r}) \partial_{r}(r \cdot)$ ( $m_{0}$ is the mass). We consider the transverse confinement potential $U_{c}(\mathbf{r})=$ $m_{0} \omega_{\perp}^{2}\left(x^{2}+y^{2}\right) / 2$, with lengthscale $a_{\perp}=\left(2 \hbar / m_{0} \omega_{\perp}\right)^{1 / 2}$. The solution of the two-body problem [13, 14] reveals that a single dimer (composite boson) state exists for arbitrary $a$, where the dimensionless binding energy $\Omega_{B}$
and (longitudinal) size $a_{B}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{B}=-\frac{E_{B}}{2 \hbar \omega_{\perp}}=\left(a_{\perp} / 2 a_{B}\right)^{2}>0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

follow from $\zeta\left(1 / 2, \Omega_{B}\right)=-a_{\perp} / a$ with the Hurvitz zeta function. For an experimental verification, see Ref. 18]. For $a_{\perp} / a \rightarrow-\infty$, the BCS limit with $\Omega_{B} \simeq\left(a / a_{\perp}\right)^{2} \ll 1$ and $a_{B} \simeq a_{\perp}^{2} / 2|a|$ is reached, while for $a_{\perp} / a \rightarrow+\infty$, the dimer (or BEC) limit emerges, with $\Omega_{B} \simeq\left(a_{\perp} / 2 a\right)^{2} \gg 1$ and $a_{B} \simeq a$. The atom-atom scattering length is

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{a a}=a_{\perp}\left(\mathcal{C}-a_{\perp} / a\right) / 2, \quad \mathcal{C}=-\zeta(1 / 2) \simeq 1.4603 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

For low energies, this result is reproduced by the 1D atom-atom interaction $V_{a a}\left(z, z^{\prime}\right)=g_{a a} \delta\left(z-z^{\prime}\right)$ with $g_{a a}=-2 \hbar^{2} / m_{0} a_{a a}$ 13]. The CIR (where $g_{a a} \rightarrow \pm \infty$ ) takes place for $a_{\perp} / a=\mathcal{C}$, which is equivalent to $\Omega_{B}=1$. In this paper, we solve the 1D fermionic four-body ( $\uparrow \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow$ ) problem and show that this also solves the $N$-body problem for arbitrary $\Omega_{B}$ in the low-energy regime.

Let us first discuss general symmetries of the four-body problem. We denote the positions of the $\uparrow(\downarrow)$ fermions by $\mathbf{x}_{1,4}\left(\mathbf{x}_{2,3}\right)$, respectively, and then form distance vectors between unlike fermions, $\mathbf{r}_{1}=\mathbf{x}_{1}-\mathbf{x}_{2}, \mathbf{r}_{2}=\mathbf{x}_{4}-\mathbf{x}_{3}$, and $\mathbf{r}_{+}=\mathbf{x}_{1}-\mathbf{x}_{3}, \mathbf{r}_{-}=\mathbf{x}_{4}-\mathbf{x}_{2}$. The distance vector between dimers $\{12\}$ and $\{34\}$ is $\mathbf{R} / \sqrt{2}=\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}+\mathbf{x}_{2}-\mathbf{x}_{3}-\mathbf{x}_{4}\right) / 2$. After an orthogonal transformation, the center-of-mass coordinate decouples and the four-body wavefunction $\Psi$ depends only on $\mathbf{r}_{1,2}$ and $\mathbf{R}$. With respect to dimer interchange, $\Psi$ is symmetric,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi\left(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{R}\right)=\Psi\left(\mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{r}_{1},-\mathbf{R}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

while under the exchange of identical fermions,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi\left(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{R}\right)=-\Psi\left(\mathbf{r}_{ \pm}, \mathbf{r}_{\mp}, \pm\left(\mathbf{r}_{1}-\mathbf{r}_{2}\right) / \sqrt{2}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The four-body Schrödinger equation then reads

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{m_{0}}\left(\Delta_{\mathbf{r}_{1}}+\Delta_{\mathbf{r}_{2}}+\Delta_{\mathbf{R}}\right)+U_{c}\left(\mathbf{r}_{1}\right)+U_{c}\left(\mathbf{r}_{2}\right)\right.} \\
& \left.+U_{c}(\mathbf{R})+V\left(\mathbf{r}_{2}\right)-E\right] \Psi=-\sum_{i=1, \pm} V\left(\mathbf{r}_{i}\right) \Psi \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

The pseudopotentials on the r.h.s. are incorporated via Bethe-Peierls boundary conditions imposed when a dimer is contracted, e.g.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\Psi\left(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{R}\right)\right|_{\mathbf{r}_{1} \rightarrow 0} \simeq \frac{f\left(\mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{R}\right)}{4 \pi r_{1}}\left(1-r_{1} / a\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

All other boundary conditions can also be expressed in terms of $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R})$ using Eqs. (3) and (4), where

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R})=f(-\mathbf{r},-\mathbf{R}), \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

expresses (parity) invariance of Eq. (5) under $\mathbf{r}_{1,2} \rightarrow$ $-\mathbf{r}_{1,2}$ and $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow-\mathbf{R}$ in combination with Eq. (3). In order to appreciate the importance of Eq. (77), it is instructive to expand $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R})$ in terms of the single-particle eigenfunctions $\psi_{\lambda}(\mathbf{r})$ and the two-body scattering states $\Phi_{\lambda}(\mathbf{r})$ in the presence of the confinement,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R})=\sum_{\mu \nu} f_{\mu \nu} \Phi_{\mu}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\nu}(\mathbf{R}) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The quantum numbers $\lambda$ include the 1D momentum $k$ [21], the (integer) angular momentum $m$, and the radial quantum number $n=0,1,2, \ldots$. Explicit expressions for $\psi_{\lambda}$ and $\Phi_{\lambda}$ can be found in Refs. 13, 16]. While both have the same energy $E_{\lambda}$, the $\Phi_{\lambda}$ now include the dimer bound state (denoted by $\lambda=0) \Phi_{0}(\mathbf{r})$. For relative longitudinal momentum $k$ of the two dimers, the total energy is (excluding zero-point and center-of-mass motion)

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=-2 \hbar \omega_{\perp} \Omega_{B}+\frac{\hbar^{2} k^{2}}{2 m_{0}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider the low-energy regime $k a_{\perp}<1$, where the relative dimer motion is in the lowest transverse state ( $n=m=0$ ) when dimers are far apart. We then have to deal with a 1D dimer-dimer scattering problem in this 'open' channel, where the asymptotic $1 D$ scattering state $f_{0}(Z)$ for $|Z| \gg \max \left(a_{\perp},\left|a_{a a}\right|\right)$ follows from Eq. (8) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R})=\Phi_{0}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\perp, 00}\left(\sqrt{X^{2}+Y^{2}}\right) f_{0}(Z) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\psi_{\perp, 00}$ is the transverse part of $\psi_{n=0, m=0}$. The symmetry relation (7) now enforces $f_{0}(Z)=f_{0}(-Z)$, reflecting the fact that two (composite) bosons collide, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{0}(Z)=e^{-i k|Z|}+(1+2 \tilde{f}(k)) e^{i k|Z|} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

As long as only $s$-wave scattering is important, symmetry considerations thus rule out odd-parity solutions normally present in 1D scattering problems 13, 16]. This crucial observation implies that, assuming analyticity, the 1D scattering amplitude can be expanded in terms of a $1 D$ dimer-dimer scattering length $a_{d d}$ 22],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{f}(k)=-1+i k a_{d d}+\mathcal{O}\left(k^{2}\right) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $\left|k a_{d d}\right| \ll 1$, this also follows from the zero-range 1D dimer-dimer potential

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{d d}\left(Z, Z^{\prime}\right)=g_{d d} \delta\left(Z-Z^{\prime}\right), \quad g_{d d}=-\frac{2 \hbar^{2}}{\left(2 m_{0}\right) a_{d d}} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

We stress that Eq. (13) holds for arbitrary $a_{\perp} / a$, and therefore 1D dimer-dimer scattering at low energies is always characterized by a simple $\delta$-interaction.

Let us then analyze the $B C S$ limit, $\Omega_{B} \ll 1$, where the scattering problem is kinematically 1D on lengthscales exceeding $a_{\perp}$. Projecting Eq. (5) onto the transverse ground state, the 1D Schrödinger equation for four attractively interacting fermions reads with $a_{a a}=$ $a_{\perp}^{2} / 2|a| \gg a_{\perp}$, see Eq. (2),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{2 m_{0} E}{\hbar^{2}}+\sum_{i=1}^{4} \partial_{z_{i}}^{2}+\frac{4}{a_{a a}} \sum_{i<j} \delta\left(z_{i}-z_{j}\right)\right) \Psi=0 \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the second sum excludes identical fermion pairs, $(i, j)$ corresponding to $\{14\}$ and $\{23\}$. The Bethe Ansatz expresses the wavefunction as a sum of products of plane waves [23]. Let us choose the momenta $a_{a a} k_{1,4}=\mp i-$ $u / 2$ and $a_{a a} k_{3,2}=\mp i+u / 2$ to describe dimer-dimer scattering, and measure lengths in units of $a_{a a}$. The energy of this state is $E=\hbar^{2}\left(-2+u^{2} / 2\right) /\left(m_{0} a_{a a}^{2}\right)$ and $u$ the relative momentum of the two dimers. Up to an overall normalization constant, the wavefunction in the domain $\mathcal{D}_{1}=\left\{\left(z_{1}, z_{4}\right)<\left(z_{3}, z_{2}\right)\right\}$ must then be given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{1} & =e^{-\left(z_{2}+z_{3}-z_{4}-z_{1}\right)}\left(e^{i u\left(z_{2}+z_{4}-z_{3}-z_{1}\right) / 2}\right. \\
& -e^{i u\left(z_{2}+z_{1}-z_{3}-z_{4}\right) / 2}+e^{i u\left(z_{3}+z_{1}-z_{2}-z_{4}\right) / 2} \\
& \left.-e^{i u\left(z_{3}+z_{4}-z_{2}-z_{1}\right) / 2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

to ensure a normalizable and antisymmetric solution under exchange of identical fermions. Consider next a second domain, $\mathcal{D}_{2}=\left\{z_{1}<z_{3}<z_{4}<z_{2}\right\}$, where $z_{3}$ and $z_{4}$ are exchanged compared to $\mathcal{D}_{1}$. At the boundary between $\mathcal{D}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{2}, z_{3}=z_{4}$, Eq. (14) implies $\Psi_{1}=\Psi_{2}$ and $\left(\partial_{z_{3}}-\partial_{z_{4}}\right)\left(\Psi_{1}-\Psi_{2}\right)=-4 \Psi_{1}$ [24], leading to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{2} & =2 \operatorname{Re}\left[e^{-\left(z_{2}+z_{3}-z_{4}-z_{1}\right)} \frac{i u}{2+i u} e^{i u\left(z_{2}+z_{4}-z_{3}-z_{1}\right) / 2}\right. \\
& +e^{-\left(z_{2}+z_{4}-z_{3}-z_{1}\right)}\left(\frac{2}{2+i u} e^{i u\left(z_{2}+z_{3}-z_{4}-z_{1}\right) / 2}\right. \\
& \left.\left.-2 e^{\left.i u\left(z_{2}+z_{1}-z_{4}-z_{3}\right) / 2\right)}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

The wavefunction in other domains can be found in a similar manner. As a result, for a large dimer-dimer distance $Z, \Psi \propto e^{-\left|z_{+}\right|} e^{-\left|z_{-}\right|} f_{0}(Z)$, where $e^{-\left|z_{ \pm}\right|}$is the 1 D wavefunction of the dimer $\{13\}$ and $\{24\}$, respectively. This result shows explicitly that even in the BCS limit, the two dimers are not broken in the collision even for large $k$. There is no coupling to additional fermionic states, and the composite nature of the dimer is not apparent in $\Psi$. The 1D scattering state $f_{0}(Z)$, see Eq. (11), has the exact scattering amplitude

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{f}(k)=-\frac{1}{1+i k a_{d d}}, \quad a_{d d}=\frac{a_{a a}}{2}=\frac{a_{\perp}^{2}}{4|a|}, \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

which reproduces the full scattering amplitude derived from Eq. (13) and not just the first order as in Eq. (12).

The bound state at imaginary $k$ predicted by Eq. (15) is however unphysical, since the corresponding Bethe Ansatz solutions are then not normalizable. It would correspond to a non-existent bound four-fermion (tetramer) state, and hence Eq. (15) is restricted to the real axis.

Let us now turn to the many-body problem, starting with the BCS limit. Since dimers are not broken in the collision, the ground state can be described in terms of $N / 2$ bosons ('bosonization') with the interaction (13) and $a_{d d}=a_{a a} / 2$. The attractively interacting Bose gas is stabilized by the real- $k$ restriction, implying the omission of many-body bosonic bound states. Bosonization is possible for $\rho a_{\perp}<1$, since typical momenta are $k \approx \rho$ for total 1D fermionic density $\rho$. This reasoning immediately leads to the famous Lieb-Liniger (LL) equations [25],

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{E_{0}}{N} & =-\hbar \omega_{\perp} \Omega_{B}+\frac{1}{\rho} \int_{-K_{0}}^{K_{0}} d k \frac{\hbar^{2} k^{2}}{4 m_{0}} f(k),  \tag{16a}\\
2 \pi f(k) & =1-\frac{4}{a_{d d}} \int_{-K_{0}}^{K_{0}} d p \frac{f(p)}{4 / a_{d d}^{2}+(p-k)^{2}}, \tag{16b}
\end{align*}
$$

where $E_{0}$ is the ground state energy and $K_{0}$ is fixed by $\rho / 2=\int_{-K_{0}}^{K_{0}} d k f(k)$. Notably, since $a_{d d}=a_{a a} / 2$, the LL equations coincide with Yang-Gaudin equations for $N$ attractively interacting 1D fermions, thereby explaining a deep connection noticed previously 11, 12, 26]. Moving towards the dimer limit, Eq. (13) still applies, but now only for sufficiently small $k$ such that Eq. (12) holds, and $a_{d d} \neq a_{a a} / 2$. For $a_{d d} \lesssim a_{\perp}$, one leaves the BCS regime and enters the 'crossover regime', while (once $a_{d d}<0$ ) the dimer regime is realized for $\left|a_{d d}\right| \gtrsim a_{\perp}$. Within the crossover regime, $\left|a_{d d}\right| \lesssim a_{\perp}$, we have hard-core bosons that can effectively be fermionized 11, 12], again implying typical momenta $k \approx \rho$. For $\rho a_{\perp}<1$, the condition $\left|k a_{d d}\right| \ll 1$ imposed by Eq. (12) is therefore safely fulfilled throughout the crossover regime. Finally, in the dimer limit, $a<a_{\perp}$, fermions form very tightly bound dimers. The confinement can then not influence the fourbody collision, which is therefore described by a 3 D zerorange interaction with $a_{d d}^{3 D} \approx 0.6 a$ [15]. However, for dimer-dimer distance larger than $a_{\perp}$, dimers eventually must occupy the transverse ground state, see Eq. (10). In effect, for $\rho a_{\perp}<1$, we recover a 1D (bosonic) twobody problem, where Eq. (2) gives the answer (exact for $\Omega_{B} \gg 1$ ),

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{d d}=-\frac{a_{\mathrm{red}, \perp}^{2}}{2(0.6 a)}, \quad a_{\mathrm{red}, \perp}=\left(\hbar^{2} / m_{0} \omega_{\perp}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{\mathrm{red}, \perp}$ is the transverse oscillator length for dimers. To summarize this discussion, we have shown that (a) as long as the single condition $k a_{\perp}<1$ holds, dimer-dimer scattering is described by Eq. (13) for arbitrary $a_{\perp} / a$, and (b) knowledge of $a_{d d}$ and hence the solution of the 1D four-body problem is sufficient to completely solve the 1D BEC-BCS many-body problem for dilute systems, $\rho a_{\perp}<1$, in terms of the LL equations (16).

Next we discuss the $1 D$ four-body problem. Enforcing the boundary condition (6) or the other equivalent ones,


FIG. 1: Scattering length $a_{d d}$ as a function of $\Omega_{B}$. Dashed curves give exact limiting results, the solid curve interpolates by adding these. Inset: Same but neglecting all closedchannel excitations. Here the solid curve gives the exact result.

Eq. (5) leads to an integral equation for $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R})$ 15, 16]. Using Eq. (8), some algebra [27] yields

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[\zeta\left(1 / 2, \frac{E_{\mu}+E_{\nu}-E}{2 \hbar \omega_{\perp}}\right)-\zeta\left(1 / 2, \Omega_{B}\right)\right] f_{\mu \nu}}  \tag{18}\\
& =\frac{4 \pi \hbar^{2} a_{\perp}}{\sqrt{2} m_{0}} \sum_{\mu^{\prime} \nu^{\prime}} \mathcal{G}_{\mu \nu}^{\mu^{\prime} \nu^{\prime}} f_{\mu^{\prime} \nu^{\prime}}, \\
& \mathcal{G}_{\mu \nu}^{\mu^{\prime} \nu^{\prime}}=\sum_{ \pm} \int d \mathbf{r} d \mathbf{R} G_{E-E_{\mu}-E_{\nu}}((\mathbf{r} \pm \sqrt{2} \mathbf{R}) / 2,0) \\
& \Phi_{\mu}^{*}\left(\frac{\mathbf{r} \mp \sqrt{2} \mathbf{R}}{2}\right) \psi_{\nu}^{*}\left(\mp \frac{\mathbf{r}}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \Phi_{\mu^{\prime}}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\nu^{\prime}}(\mathbf{R}) .
\end{align*}
$$

The two-body Green's function $G_{E}(\mathbf{r}, 0)$ can be found in Ref. [16]. The two degrees of freedom in $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R})$ imply two different types of 'closed' channels that may be excited in a dimer-dimer collision: (i) scattering states above the bound state for each dimer [corresponding to $\mathbf{r}$ or $\mu$ in Eq. (8)], and (ii) excited states in the transverse direction for the relative motion of two dimers [corresponding to $\mathbf{R}$ or $\nu$ in Eq. [8]]. Neglecting both types of closed-channel excitations, Eq. (18) can be solved numerically for arbitrary $a_{\perp} / a$ as in Ref. 16]. The result is shown in the inset of Fig. 11 In addition, this approximation allows to extract $a_{d d}$ in both limits analytically: in the dimer limit, we find $a_{d d}=-\kappa_{0} a_{\perp}^{2} /(2 a)+2 \kappa_{1} a$, where $\kappa_{0}=1 / 4$ and $\kappa_{1} \simeq 0.319$, while in the BCS limit, $a_{d d}=\eta_{0} a_{\perp}^{2} /|a|$ with $\eta_{0} \simeq 0.402$. The exact (numerical) result for arbitrary $a_{\perp} / a$ agrees to within $\pm 0.05$ in $a_{d d} / a_{\perp}$ with a simple interpolation formula obtained by simply adding these two limiting results. For practical purposes, the interpolation is therefore virtually exact. Let us then turn to the effects of closed-channel excitations. In the BCS limit, excitations of type (ii) are irrelevant [16], but type-(i) excitations are important. Their inclusion results in the exact value $\eta_{0}=1 / 4$, see Eq. (15), which also follows from the solution of Eq. (18) including


FIG. 2: Squared ratio of breathing and dipole mode frequency as a function of $-a_{\perp} / a$. Here we have chosen $N \omega_{z} / \omega_{\perp}=1 / 3$.
type-(i) excitations 27]. In the dimer limit, inclusion of the closed channels leads to the correct value $\kappa_{0} \approx 0.83$, see Eq. (17). Incidentally, the two excitation types can be disentangled [27], and we find $a_{d d}^{3 D} \approx 0.66 a$ by just neglecting type-(i) excitations, which is already close to the exact value $a_{d d}^{3 D} \approx 0.6 a$ 15]. Type-(ii) excitations are obviously important in the dimer limit, which may be valuable input for diagrammatics 11, 28. The exact limiting results for $a_{d d}$ are shown in the main part of Fig. 1 as dashed curves. For the full crossover, the addi-
tive interpolation formula is again expected to be highly accurate. Notably, this predicts $a_{d d}=0$ for $\Omega_{B} \approx 0.3$. At this point, a CIR for dimer-dimer scattering occurs, see Eq. (13), where the interaction strength $g_{d d}$ diverges and changes sign. Interestingly, the dimer-dimer CIR takes place at a different value for $\Omega_{B}$ (and hence $\left.a_{\perp} / a\right)$ than the atom-atom CIR.

In experiments, quasi-1D regimes can be obtained in arrays of very elongated traps with a shallow confinement in the longitudinal direction. Typical trap frequencies are $\omega_{\perp} / 2 \pi \approx 70 \mathrm{kHz}$ and $\omega_{z} / 2 \pi \approx 250 \mathrm{~Hz}$, with $N \approx 100$ atoms per tube to ensure the 1D condition $N<\omega_{\perp} / \omega_{z}$ 18]. The BCS-BEC crossover can be investigated using a Feshbach resonance, which leads to changes in the density profile [11], excitation gaps 12] and ground state energy that can be probed via release energy [5] and rf spectroscopy measurements [6, 18]. A probably more precise approach is to measure collective axial modes. The dipole mode frequency is always $\omega_{z}$, irrespective of interactions. Using a sum rule approach [29], we calculated the frequency of the lowest compressional (breathing) mode from the mean-square size of the cloud $\omega^{2}=-2\left(d \ln \left\langle z^{2}\right\rangle / d \omega_{z}^{2}\right)^{-1}$, see Fig. 2 by solving Eqs. (16) using our results for $a_{d d}$. Limiting values are $\omega=\sqrt{3} \omega_{z}$ in the dimer limit, and $\omega=2 \omega_{z}$ both in the BCS limit and close to $a_{d d}=0$. We hope that this prediction will soon be tested. - This work was supported by the DFG-SFB TR12.
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