

# Mott states under the influence of fermion-boson conversion: Invasion of superfluidity

Fei Zhou

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia,  
6224 Agricultural Road, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, V6T 1Z1  
(Dated: March 23, 2024)

I study the influence of fermion-boson conversion near Feshbach resonances on Mott states of Cooper pairs and demonstrate possible invasion of superfluidity. The quantum dynamics of Fermi-Bose gases is studied using both an effective coupled  $U(1) \times U(1)$  quantum rotor Hamiltonian and a coupled  $XXZ \times XXZ$  spin Hamiltonian. I also point out two distinct branches of collective modes in superfluid states, one of which involves anti-symmetric phase oscillations in fermionic and bosonic channels and is always gapped because of fermion-boson conversion.

Recent activities on atomic systems near Feshbach resonances have generated much interest. By varying the two-body scattering length near Feshbach resonances, several groups have successfully achieved fermionic superfluid in a strongly interacting regime<sup>2,3,4</sup>. Superfluid states near Feshbach resonances turn out to be related to the BCS-BEC crossover studied long time ago<sup>5,6,7,8</sup>. This was recently pointed out by a few groups<sup>9,10,11,12,13,14</sup>. These groups have also made various efforts to incorporate the two-body resonance between Cooper pairs (open channel) and molecules (close channel) explicitly in the many-body Hamiltonian and clearly illustrated an interesting role of atomic resonances. Near a Feshbach resonance the usual Cooper pairing amplitude and molecule condensate wave function are proportional to each other; the Feshbach resonance introduces an effective interaction between fermions, the interaction constant of which is  $\frac{2}{F_B} = (2 - v)$ . Here  $F_B$  is the resonance width,  $v$  is the detuning energy of molecules and  $\epsilon$  is the chemical potential of fermions.

In this letter I am going to study a Mott state under the influence of Feshbach resonances, especially the effect of fermion-boson conversion. A Mott state of bosons or of Cooper pairs appears whenever bosons or Cooper pairs in lattices are strongly repulsively interacting and if the corresponding filling factors are integers. One of important properties of a Mott state is its incompressibility, or a finite energy gap in its excitation spectra. And when hopping is renormalized to be zero due to repulsive interactions, the number of particles at each site is strictly quantized and discrete; particles are locally conserved. I am going to show that in general Mott states are unstable with respect to fermion-boson conversion near Feshbach resonances. The primary reason is that fermions or bosons involved in resonating conversion are not conserved separately. So the conversion not only mediates an attractive interaction between fermions as realized before, but also, more importantly violates the local conservation law and introduces a novel mechanism to transport particles in some limit. The necessary condition for particles to be localized, or the number of fermions or bosons should be quantized might no longer exist. I find the invasion of superfluidity into a part of a

parameter space where only Mott states are expected to be ground states if there are no Feshbach resonances.

The model I employ to study this subject is an  $M$ -orbital Fermi-Bose Hubbard Model (FBHM). Consider the following general form of FBHM

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= H_f + H_b + H_{fb}; \\
 H_f &= t_f \sum_{\langle kl \rangle} (f_k^\dagger f_l + \text{h.c.}) \\
 &+ \sum_k \left( \epsilon_k f_k^\dagger f_k + \frac{V_f}{4} \sum_k \hat{n}_{fk} (\hat{n}_{fk} - 1) \right); \\
 H_b &= t_b \sum_{\langle kl \rangle} (b_k^\dagger b_l + \text{h.c.}) \\
 &+ \sum_k \left( (v - 2) \epsilon_k b_k^\dagger b_k + V_b \sum_k \hat{n}_{bk} (\hat{n}_{bk} - 1) \right); \\
 H_{fb} &= \frac{V_{fb}}{F_B} \sum_k (b_k^\dagger f_k - f_k^\dagger b_k + \text{h.c.}) \\
 &+ V_{bf} \sum_k \hat{n}_{bk} \hat{n}_{fk}; \tag{1}
 \end{aligned}$$

Here  $k, l$  and label lattice sites, on-site orbits and spins;  $\epsilon_k = 1; 2; \dots; M$ ,  $\epsilon_l = \epsilon_k + 1; \dots; M$ .  $f_k^\dagger$  ( $f_k$ ) is the creation (annihilation) operator of a fermion at site  $k$ , with on-site orbital energy  $\epsilon_k$  and spin  $\epsilon_k$ .  $b_k^\dagger$  ( $b_k$ ) is the creation (annihilation) operator of a boson at site  $k$  (For simplicity, I assume there is only one bosonic orbital degree of freedom at each site). The fermion and boson number operators are, respectively,  $\hat{n}_{bk} = b_k^\dagger b_k$ ,  $\hat{n}_{fk} = f_k^\dagger f_k$ .  $t_f$  and  $t_b$  are hopping integrals of fermions and bosons respectively and hopping occurs over neighboring sites labeled as  $\langle kl \rangle$ .  $V_f$  is the attractive coupling constant in the Cooper channel which I assume to be much larger than the rest of couplings. Finally,  $V_f$ ,  $V_b$  and  $V_{fb}$  are the strength of repulsive interactions between fermions, bosons, and fermions and bosons in the density-density channel<sup>15</sup> (One further assumes  $V_b V_f > V_{fb}^2$  to ensure that homogeneous states are

stable). FBHM similar to Eq.(1) were previously applied to study Bose-Fermi mixtures in optical lattices<sup>16</sup>; most recently an FBHM with fermion-boson conversion was generalized to study the BCS-BEC crossover in lattices<sup>17</sup>. In the absence of the conversion term, FBHM consists of decoupled (attractive) Fermi-Hubbard model and Bose-Hubbard model; main properties of latter are known<sup>18</sup>.

First study the large- $n$  limit where  $n_b$  and  $n_f$  ( $M$ ), the average numbers of fermions and bosons are both much bigger than unity. Because  $n$  is much larger than other coupling constants, the ground state of fermions for the on-site part of the Hamiltonian  $H_f$  should be a BCS state. This suggests that it should be convenient to work with the following coherent state representation,

$$|f_{fk}g; f_{bk}g\rangle = \prod_k \frac{1}{n_{bk}!} \exp(-i_{bk}) b_k^{n_{bk}} \prod_k \frac{1}{n_{fk}!} \exp(-i_{fk}) f_k^{n_{fk}} |vac\rangle : \quad (2)$$

Here  $v; u$  are the coherence factor in the BCS wave function which minimizes the total on-site energy;  $g_0(n_{bk})$  is a unity for  $n_{max} + n_b > n_{bk} > n_b$ ,  $n_{max}, n_{max}$  is much larger than one. These states form a low energy Hilbert subspace and are orthogonal in the limit which interests us, or  $\langle f_{fk}^0 g; f_{bk}^0 g | f_{fk} g; f_{fk} g \rangle$  is equal to zero if  $f_{fk} \notin f_{fk}^0$  or  $b_{bk} \notin b_{bk}^0$ . At last, in the coherent-state representation one can show that  $\hat{n}_{fk}=2 = i\partial/\partial i_{fk}$ , and  $\hat{n}_{bk} = i\partial/\partial i_{bk}$ ; or

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \hat{n}_{fk} \exp(-i_{fk}^0) &= -i_{fk}^0 \exp(-i_{fk}); \\ \hat{n}_{bk} \exp(-i_{bk}^0) &= -i_{bk}^0 \exp(-i_{bk}); \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In the subspace spanned by the coherent states defined above, I find that the effective Hamiltonian is

$$H_{eff} = \sum_{\langle k,l \rangle} J_f \cos(\phi_{fk} - \phi_{fl}) + \frac{V_f}{4} \sum_k (\hat{n}_{fk} - n_f)^2 + \sum_{\langle k,l \rangle} J_b \cos(\phi_{bk} - \phi_{bl}) + V_b \sum_k (\hat{n}_{bk} - n_b)^2 + \sum_k F_{FB} \cos(\phi_{fk} - \phi_{bk}) + V_{fb} \sum_k (\hat{n}_{bk} - n_b)(\hat{n}_{fk} - n_f) \quad (4)$$

The exchange couplings  $J_f, J_b$  and  $F_{FB}$  can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} J_f &= t_f^2 \sum_{\sigma} \frac{u v u^0 v^0}{E_{\sigma} + E_{\sigma}^0}; \\ J_b &= n_b t_b; \quad F_{FB} = F_{FB} \frac{p}{n_b} u v; \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$E_{\sigma} = \frac{p}{(\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{4}) + \frac{1}{4}}$  is the quasi-particle energy and  $E_0$  is the on-site BCS energy gap. Furthermore,  $n_f$  and  $n_b$  are functions of  $\mu, v$  and  $V_{f;b;fb}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} n_f &= \frac{2V_b(\mu + V_f=4) - V_{fb}(2 - v + V_b)}{V_f V_b - V_{bf}^2} \\ n_b &= \frac{V_f(2 - v + V_b) - V_{bf}(2 + V_f=2)}{2(V_f V_b - V_{bf}^2)}; \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Obviously, the detuning energy  $v$  has to be sufficiently small in order for the population of bosons  $n_b$  to be positive.

Eq.(3) and Eq.(4) define the low energy quantum dynamics of fermions and bosons under the influence of fermion-boson conversion near Feshbach resonances. In the absence of both Feshbach resonances ( $F_{FB} = 0$ ) and  $V_{fb}$ , the effective Hamiltonian describes two decoupled sets of quantum U(1) rotors in a lattice, the behaviors of which are well known. If  $n_f=2$  or  $n_b$  is a positive integer, the effective model can be used to study superfluid-Mott state transitions. A Mott phase corresponds to U(1) symmetry restored states and U(1)-symmetry breaking solutions represent a superfluid phase. For the bosonic (Cooper pair) sector, the phase transition takes place when  $r_f = zJ_f/V_f$  ( $r_b = zJ_b/V_b$ ) is equal to a critical value  $r_{fc}$  ( $r_{bc}$ ) ( $z > 1$ ) is the coordination number). The critical values which are of order of unity are usually calculated numerically.

In the presence of  $F_{FB}$ , the Hamiltonian describes a coupled U(1) × U(1) quantum rotor model in a lattice. U(1) × U(1) symmetry breaking solutions when both  $r_{fb}$  are much larger than unity correspond to a superfluid phase. In the superfluid phase, the Hamiltonian in Eq.(4) further leads to the following semiclassical equation of motion in the long wavelength limit

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \phi_{fk}}{\partial t} &= V_f \hat{n}_{fk} + 2V_{fb} \hat{n}_{bk}; \\ \frac{\partial \phi_{bk}}{\partial t} &= 2V_b \hat{n}_{bk} + V_{bf} \hat{n}_{fk}; \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{fk}}{\partial t} &= J_f \phi_{fk} + F_{FB} (\phi_{bk} - \phi_{fk}); \\ \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{bk}}{\partial t} &= J_b \phi_{bk} + F_{FB} (\phi_{fk} - \phi_{bk}); \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here  $\hat{n}_{fk,bk} = \hat{n}_{fk,bk} - n_{f;b}$ . I have taken a continuum limit and  $k$  labels the coordinate of phases of bosons and fermion pairs ( $\phi_{k,bk}$ ) in this equation;  $\nabla^2$  is a Laplacian operator. The lattice constant has been set to be one. This semiclassical equation shows that there are two branches of collective modes the dispersion relations of which are given below:

$$\begin{aligned} a) \omega^2 &= \nabla^2 \phi_f^2; \quad \phi_f(!; Q ! 0) = \phi_b(!; Q ! 0); \\ b) \omega^2 &= \frac{1}{4} + \nabla^2 \phi_f^2; \\ \phi_f(!; Q ! 0) &= \frac{V_f - V_{fb}}{V_b - V_{fb}} \phi_b(!; Q ! 0); \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$\phi_{f;b}(!; Q)$  are the Fourier components of phase fields  $\phi_{fk,bk}(t)$ . In general,  $\omega_0$ , and  $\omega_{fb}$  depend on various

parameters in the Hamiltonian; and  $\phi_0$  is always proportional to  $V_{FB}$  and  $\phi$  on the other hand is independent of  $V_{FB}$ . When  $V_{fb} = 0$ ,  $V_f = V_b = V_0$  and  $J_f = J_b = J_0$ , the dispersion relations are given as  $\omega_0^2 = 2V_{FB}V_0$ ,  $\omega_{\pm}^2 = 2J_0V_0$ .

It is worth emphasizing that in the long wave length limit, mode a) is fully symmetric in phase oscillations of fermions and bosons, independent of various parameters; mode b) represents out-of-phase oscillations in fermionic and bosonic channel and becomes fully antisymmetric when  $V_b = V_f$ . In the absence of conversion ( $V_{FB} = 0$ ), these two modes correspond to two gapless Goldstone modes associated with breaking two decoupled U(1) symmetries. However, in the presence of Feshbach resonances only the symmetric mode a) remains gapless corresponding to the usual Goldstone mode of superfluid while the antisymmetric mode b) is fully gapped because of the phase-locking effect of Feshbach resonances.

In general, the wave functions for the many-body ground state and excitations  $\psi_n(\mathbf{f}_{bk}; \mathbf{f}_{fk}; g)$  ( $n = 0$  is the ground state) are the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian in Eq.(4). The boundary conditions are periodic along the directions of  $\mathbf{f}_{fk}, \mathbf{f}_{bk}$  with a period  $2\pi$ , so the wave functions are effectively defined on an  $S^1$  torus with radius of each  $S^1$  equal to  $2\pi$ . If the average number  $n_f = 2$  and  $n_b$  are integers, one introduces a gauge transformation  $\psi_k \rightarrow \psi_k \exp(i n_f \mathbf{f}_{fk} - 2 i n_b \mathbf{f}_{bk})$ ; the shifted number operators become  $\hat{n}_{fk} = 2 = i\partial/\partial \mathbf{f}_{fk}$ ,  $\hat{n}_{bk} = i\partial/\partial \mathbf{f}_{bk}$ . In this new basis, a spontaneous-symmetry breaking solution with wave function  $\psi_k(\mathbf{f}_{fk}, \mathbf{f}_{bk}) = \psi_k(\mathbf{f}_{fk}, \mathbf{f}_{bk})$  represents a typical superfluid state. A symmetry-unbroken solution with wave function  $\psi_k(2\pi)^{-1} \exp(i \mathbf{m}_{fk} \mathbf{f}_{fk}) \exp(i \mathbf{m}_{bk} \mathbf{f}_{bk})$  ( $\mathbf{m}_{fk}, \mathbf{m}_{bk} = 0$  for all  $k$ ) on the other hand corresponds to a Mott state with  $\hat{n}_{fk}(\mathbf{f}_{bk}) = 0$  or  $\hat{n}_{fk}(\mathbf{f}_{bk}) = n_f(\mathbf{f}_{bk})$  at each lattice site.

To understand the influence of Feshbach resonances on Mott states, I now consider a situation where again both  $n_b$  and  $n_f = 2$  are integers and  $r_f$  is much less than  $r_{fc}$  so that Cooper pairs are in a Mott state in the absence of Feshbach resonance. On the other hand  $n_b$  is much less than the critical value  $n_{bc}$  so that bosons are condensed. For simplicity, I have also assumed that  $V_{bf}$  is much smaller than  $V_f$  so that it can be treated as a perturbation. I am interested in the responses of Cooper-pair Mott states to fermion-boson conversion and carry out the rest of discussions in a mean field approximation (MFA). In this MFA,  $\mathbf{f}_{fk} = \mathbf{f}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}_{bk} = \mathbf{b}$  for any lattice site  $k$ . The ground state  $\psi_0(\mathbf{b}; \mathbf{f})$  (again defined on an  $S^1 \times S^1$  torus with radius  $2\pi$ ) is the lowest energy state of the following mean field Hamiltonian

$$H_{MFA} = V_f \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mathbf{f}^2} + V_b \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mathbf{b}^2} + 2V_{fb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{f}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{b}} + z(J_f \cos \mathbf{f} + J_b \cos \mathbf{b}) + V_{FB} \cos(\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{b}); \quad (9)$$

Here again  $z$  is the coordination number; I have also in-

troduced two self-consistent order parameters

$$\mathbf{f} = \langle \cos \mathbf{f} \rangle; \quad \mathbf{b} = \langle \cos \mathbf{b} \rangle; \quad (10)$$

Here  $\langle \rangle$  stands for an average taken in the ground state. Notice that the order parameters defined above are nonzero only when the U(1) symmetries are broken; particularly,  $\mathbf{f}$  is proportional to the usual BCS pairing amplitude. Following Eq.(2) and discussions above one indeed shows that  $\langle \mathbf{f}_k^y \mathbf{f}_{k+\#}^y \rangle = (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{f}$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{b}_k^y \rangle = \frac{P}{n_b} \mathbf{b}$ .<sup>19</sup> And  $\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{b}$  vanish in a Mott state and are nonzero for superfluid states.

As  $zJ_b$  is much larger than  $V_b$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$  has very slow dynamics; and the corresponding ground state for  $\mathbf{b}$  can be approximated as a symmetry breaking solution. That is

$$\psi_0(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{b}) = \psi_0(\mathbf{f}) \psi_0(\mathbf{b}); \quad \psi_0(\mathbf{f}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{zJ_f}{V_f} \mathbf{f} + \frac{V_{FB}}{V_f} \mathbf{b} \right) \cos \mathbf{f} \right]; \quad (11)$$

Here  $\mathbf{b}$  should be approximately equal to one in this limit; and in the zeroth order of  $V_f^{-1}$ ,  $\psi_0$  doesn't break the U(1) symmetry and stands for a Mott-state solution. Finally taking into account Eq.(10) and (11), one finds that the self-consistent solution to  $\mathbf{f}$  is

$$\mathbf{f} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{V_{FB}}{V_f} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{zJ_f}{V_f} \right]^{-1}; \quad (12)$$

In the absence of  $V_{FB}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}$  vanishes as expected for a Mott state. However, the Mott state solution is unstable in the presence of any Feshbach conversion and the pairing order parameter  $\mathbf{f}$  is always nonzero in this limit.<sup>20</sup>

I want to emphasize that the average number of fermion per site is not affected by the fermion-boson conversion and remains to be an even integer (2I); rather, closely connected with the instability is the breakdown of particle quantization. Indeed, one obtains in the MFA the following results for  $\hat{n}_{fk}$ ,  $\langle \hat{n}_{fk} \rangle = n_f = 2I$ ,  $\langle \hat{n}_{fk}^2 \rangle = 1 + 2(V_{FB} = V_f)^2 / 2V_f^2$ . This illustrates that the resonance between states with different numbers of fermions at a lattice site eventually leads to a nonzero pairing amplitude  $\mathbf{f}$ .

However, if  $n_{b,f}$  are much smaller than  $n_{bc}, n_{fc}$ , then both Cooper pairs and bosons are in Mott states. Similar calculations lead to self-consistent solutions  $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{b} = 0$  and more importantly, the following correlations for  $\mathbf{bf}$   $= \langle \cos(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{f}) \rangle$ <sup>19</sup>,

$$\mathbf{bf} = \frac{V_{FB}}{2(V_f + V_b)}; \quad \mathbf{bf}^+ = 0; \quad (13)$$

The second equality above simply shows the absence of superfluidity. But the first one indicates a subtle hidden order in the Mott states under consideration. Notice that

$$\mathbf{bf} = \langle \mathbf{b}_k^y \mathbf{f}_{k+\#}^y \rangle \text{ and represents a tri-linear order.}$$

The main conclusions arrived here do not depend on the large- $n$  approximation introduced here. One can consider the opposite limit by assuming  $M = 1$  and there is only one orbital degree of freedom at each lattice site. The two interaction terms (with two interaction constant and  $V_f$ ) in  $H_f$  (see Eq. (1)) in the single orbital limit can be rewritten in one term:  $V_f^0 = 4 \sum_k \hat{n}_{fk} (\hat{n}_{fk} - 1)$  if one identifies  $V_f^0 = V_f - 2$ . In the limit where  $V_f$  is much larger than  $V_b$ , fermions are paired at each lattice site. Furthermore I assume bosons have hard core interactions ( $V_b = 1$ ) such that there can be only zero or one boson at each site.

So the low energy Hilbert subspace  $S_k$  at each lattice site  $k$  consists of four states: 1) no Cooper pair, no boson; 2) no Cooper pair, one boson; 3) one Cooper pair, no boson; 4) one Cooper pair, one boson. They also correspond to a product of two pseudo spin  $S = 1/2$  subspaces:  $S_k = S_{fk} \otimes S_{bk}$ ,  $j_{fk}^z = 1/2, j_{bk}^z = 1/2$ ;  $S_k$  is the on-site Hilbert space, and  $S_{fk}, S_{bk}$  are the on-site pseudo spin spaces for fermions and bosons respectively.  $j_{fk}^z = 1/2 = f_{fk}^y f_{fk\#}^y$ ,  $j_{bk}^z = 1/2 = b_{bk}^y b_{bk\#}^y$ ;  $j_{fk}^z = 1/2 = f_{fk}^x f_{fk\#}^x$ ,  $j_{bk}^z = 1/2 = b_{bk}^x b_{bk\#}^x$ ;  $j_{fk}^z = 1/2 = f_{fk}^z f_{fk\#}^z$ ,  $j_{bk}^z = 1/2 = b_{bk}^z b_{bk\#}^z$ . So to have superfluidity, either  $b_{bk}$  or  $f_{fk}$ , or both of them need to have a finite expectation value in the XY plane. For instance to have fermionic superfluid, the expectation values of  $f_{fk}$  need to be nonzero.

The effective Hamiltonian can then be written as<sup>19</sup>

$$H_{eff}^1 = \sum_k \left( \sum_{\langle kl \rangle} \left( \sum_{f,k} x_{fk} x_{lk} + \sum_{b,k} y_{bk} y_{lk} \right) + \sum_{f,k} z_{fk} z_{lk} + \sum_{b,k} h_{fk}^z h_{lk}^z \right)$$

$$\sum_{f,k} x_{fk} x_{lk} + \sum_{b,k} y_{bk} y_{lk} : \quad (14)$$

Here  $J_f^1 = t_f^2 = V_f^0$ ,  $J_b^1 = t_b$ ,  $\frac{1}{F_B} = \frac{1}{F_B}$ ,  $h_f^z = \frac{1}{2} + V_f^0/2$  and  $h_b^z = \frac{1}{2}$ . The Hamiltonian is invariant under a rotation around the  $z$ -axis or has an XY symmetry. The  $z$ -direction fully polarized phase of pseudo spins  $b_k$  ( $f_k$ ) represents the Mott phase of bosons (fermions) and the XY symmetry breaking states of pseudo spins  $b_k$  ( $f_k$ ) stand for the superfluid phase of bosons (fermions). The fermionic sector of this Hamiltonian was previously obtained and studied<sup>21</sup>; it was also used to study BEC-BCS crossover in lattices<sup>17</sup>.

When  $\frac{1}{F_B} = 0$ , the Mott phase of Cooper pairs with filling factor equal to one occurs when  $h_f^z$  is much larger than  $J_f$ . Assume that in this case  $h_b^z$  is much less than  $J_b$  so that  $b_k$  are ordered in the  $xy$  plane; then bosons are condensed. Taking into a finite amplitude of  $\frac{1}{F_B}$ , one considers a solution where the pseudo spin symmetry of  $b_k$  is spontaneously broken along a direction in the XY plane specified by  $\langle b_k \rangle$  (the expectation value is taken in the ground state). In the molecular mean field approximation, the effective external field acting on pseudo spins  $f_k$  is  $h_{f,eff} = z J_f \langle f_k \rangle + \frac{1}{F_B} \langle b_k \rangle + h_f^z e_z$ ; and  $\langle f_k \rangle$  is calculated self-consistently in the ground state when  $h_{f,eff}$  is applied. One then arrives at the following solution  $\langle f_k \rangle = \langle b_k \rangle = \frac{1}{F_B} = h_f^z$  where  $\langle f_k \rangle$  has been projected along the direction of  $\langle b_k \rangle$  which lies in the XY plane. As mentioned before, development of such a component signifies superfluidity, or nonzero pairing amplitude.

In conclusion, I have shown that certain Mott states are unstable with respect to the resonating fermion-boson conversion; in general superfluidity invades Mott phases because of the fermion-boson conversion. This work is supported by a Discovery grant from NSERC, Canada and a research grant from UBC. I acknowledge useful discussions with I. Alek, E. Comell and R. Hulet.

- <sup>1</sup> M. Greiner, C. A. Regal, and D. S. Jin, Nature 426, 537 (2003); C. A. Regal, M. Greiner, and D. S. Jin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 040403 (2004).
- <sup>2</sup> S. Jochim et al, Science 302, 2101 (2003).
- <sup>3</sup> M. W. Zwierlein et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 250401 (2003).
- <sup>4</sup> K. E. Strecker, G. B. Partridge and R. G. Hulet, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 080406 (2003).
- <sup>5</sup> D. M. Eagles, Phys. Rev. 186, 456 (1969).
- <sup>6</sup> A. J. Leggett, J. Phys. C (Paris) 41, 7 (1980)
- <sup>7</sup> P. Nozières and S. Schmitt-Rink, J. Low. Temp. Phys. 59, 195 (1985).
- <sup>8</sup> C. S. De Melo, M. Randeria, and J. Engelbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3202 (1993).
- <sup>9</sup> M. Holland et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 120406 (2001).
- <sup>10</sup> E. Timmermans et al, Phys. Lett. A 285, 228 (2001).
- <sup>11</sup> Y. Ohashi and A. Gri n, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 130402 (2002).

- <sup>12</sup> J. Stajic et al, Phys. Rev. A 69, 063610 (2004).
- <sup>13</sup> G. M. Falco and H. T. C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 140402 (2004).
- <sup>14</sup> R. B. Diener and T. L. Ho, cond-mat/0404517.
- <sup>15</sup> The atom-molecule and molecule-molecule scattering lengths have been calculated previously. For instance, D. S. Petrov, C. Salomon, and G. V. Shlyapnikov, Phys. Rev. A 71, 012708 (2005) and references therein.
- <sup>16</sup> In optical lattices, Bose-Fermi mixtures without fermion-boson conversion were studied in A. Albus et al, Phys. Rev. A 68, 023606 (2003); M. Lewenstein et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 050401 (2004); M. Cramer et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 190405 (2004); D. W. Wang et al, cond-mat/0410494.
- <sup>17</sup> L. D. Carr and M. J. Holland, cond-mat/0501156.
- <sup>18</sup> M. P. A. Fisher, P. B. Weichman, G. G. Grestin, and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 40, 546 (1989); also discussions on Bose-Hubbard physics in optical lattices, D. Jaksch et al,

Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3108 (1998). Bosonic Mott states were observed recently, see M. Greiner et al., Nature (London) 415, 39 (2002).

<sup>19</sup> F. Zhou, unpublished (2005).

<sup>20</sup> Eq.(12) implies the delocalization of Cooper pairs due to fermion-boson conversion, which can be shown explic-

itly. This result also indicates that the pairing amplitude be strongly renormalized by repulsive interactions in the density-density channel, an alternative point of view which is substantiated in Ref.19.

<sup>21</sup> V. J. Emery, Phys. Rev. B 14, 2989 (1976).