

Induced P-wave Superfluidity in Asymmetric Fermi Gases

Aurel Bulgac,^{*} Michael McNeil Forbes,[†] and Achim Schwenk[‡]
Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1560

We show that two new intra-species P-wave superfluid phases appear in two-component asymmetric Fermi systems with short-range S-wave interactions. In the BEC limit, phonons of the molecular BEC induce P-wave superfluidity in the excess fermions. In the BCS limit, density fluctuations induce P-wave superfluidity in both the majority and the minority species. These phases may be realized in experiments with spin-polarized Fermi gases.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Ss

Keywords: Asymmetric Fermi gases, P-wave superfluidity, induced interactions, cold atoms

The phenomenon of fermionic superfluidity spans twenty orders of magnitude, from cold atomic gases, through liquid ^3He , electronic superconductors, nuclei, and neutron stars, to quark color superconductors. Experiments with trapped cold atoms provide clean access to this physics, with tunable interactions and compositions.

In this Letter, we discuss the possibility of *P-wave* superfluidity in cold asymmetric Fermi gases comprising two species (\uparrow and \downarrow) of equal mass m , with short-range *S-wave* interactions. (The generalization to unequal masses is straightforward.) If the system is symmetric (equal number density of each species), the ground state is well described as a fully gapped superfluid: There is a crossover from a BCS state at weak attraction to a BEC of tightly-bound diatomic molecules (dimers) at strong attraction.

The ground state of asymmetric systems is not even qualitatively well understood. If the chemical potential difference $\delta\mu$ between the two species is larger than the gap Δ in the spectrum, the stability of the superfluid state is compromised. At weak coupling it is known that there must be a phase transition for $\delta\mu \leq \Delta/\sqrt{2}$ to some asymmetric state [1]. Various possible asymmetric superfluid phases have been proposed: For example, anisotropic/inhomogeneous superfluid states with crystalline structure (LOFF) [2] or deformed Fermi surfaces [3], and homogeneous gapless (breached pair) superfluids [4]. To date, all proposed phase diagrams conclude that, for large asymmetry, one finds a normal Fermi liquid [5, 6, 7].

Here we show that attractive *intra*-species P-wave interactions are induced between gapless fermions, leading to the formation of P-wave superfluids. We propose a phase diagram (Fig. 1) where phases with excess fermions are P-wave superfluids (except for the free Fermi gas consisting of a single non-interacting species). In the BEC regime, the P_1 phase consists of a molecular BEC with a single P-wave superfluid of the excess particles. In the BCS regime, the P_2 phase has two coexisting P-wave superfluids: one in the majority component, and one in the minority component.

We calculate the induced interactions that give rise to




FIG. 1: Conjectured zero-temperature grand canonical phase diagram after [6]. Scaling relations allow this two-dimensional projection of the three parameters $(\mu, a, \delta\mu)$. The chemical potential asymmetry $\delta\mu = (\mu^\uparrow - \mu^\downarrow)/2$, and the S-wave scattering-length a are expressed in units of the S-wave gap $\Delta_{\delta\mu=0}$ and density $n_{\delta\mu=0}$ of the symmetric state with the same parameters μ and a , but with $\delta\mu = 0$. The phase P_1 —a gapless superfluid with single Fermi surface in [6]—is our P-wave superfluid/BEC phase. The phase P_2 —a two-component Fermi-liquid in [6]—is our two-component P-wave phase. There may be additional P-wave phases (for instance in the breached pair phases) near the S-wave Feshbach resonance. Likewise, the exact nature of the phase(s) labeled LOFF? has yet to be determined. This phase diagram is illustrative: Our results are independent of its quantitative structure. The dotted lines in the BEC and BCS regimes represent sample trajectories of constant a and $\delta\mu$. A trap provides a radially varying μ , and would comprise concentric shells of the various phases crossed by these trajectories starting from the crosses at the center of the trap. To maximize the physical space occupied by these new phases, it might be useful to load the trap so the core is a P-wave phase as indicated by the two shorter trajectories. (Note: we have verified the qualitative structure and shape of this diagram (outside of the unitary regime) with a self-consistent mean-field crossover model.)

P-wave superfluidity in the controlled limit of small scattering length, and estimate the dependence of the P-wave gap Δ_P on the various physical parameters. These P-wave phases could soon be observed, as experiments are just starting to explore the properties of spin-polarized gases [8, 9].

BEC Regime. In the BEC limit of strong attraction, the fermions form tightly-bound molecules that condense into a BEC. For asymmetric gases, the naïve picture is that the excess fermions interact weakly with the molecules, and coexist in the “spaces” between the molecules. The resulting phase exhibits gapless fermionic excitations in a superfluid BEC and has been called a “gapless superfluid”. (This picture is supported by Ref. [10] and mean-field cross-over models.) We show, however, that phonon exchange induces an attractive P-wave interaction between the excess fermions. This interaction destabilizes the Fermi surface, forming an *intra*-species P-wave condensate on top of the molecular BEC.

To estimate the magnitude of the induced P-wave interaction U_P , and the relevant critical temperature T_c^P , we consider the exchange of a single phonon between the excess fermions. In weak coupling [26], the P-wave superfluid pairing gap is given by $\Delta_P \sim \varepsilon_F \exp[1/(N_F U_P)]$, where ε_F is the Fermi energy of the excess fermions, $N_F = mk_F/(2\pi^2\hbar^2)$ is the density of states at the Fermi surface, and $\hbar k_F$ is the Fermi momentum. The interaction induced by single phonon exchange is given by [11]

$$U_{\text{ind}}(q_0, \vec{q}) = U_{\text{fb}}^2 \frac{2 n_b E_{\vec{q}}}{q_0^2 - E_{\vec{q}}(E_{\vec{q}} + 2 n_b U_{\text{bb}})}, \quad (1)$$

where U_{fb} is the fermion-boson coupling, U_{bb} is the boson-boson coupling, $E_{\vec{q}} = q^2/(2m_b)$, $m_b = 2m$ is the mass of the molecules, and n_b is the boson density. The couplings are determined from the scattering length $a > 0$ using few-body methods [12]:

$$U_{\text{fb}} = \frac{\pi a \hbar^2}{m} \alpha_{\text{fb}} \approx \frac{\pi a \hbar^2}{m} 3.6, \quad (2a)$$

$$U_{\text{bb}} = \frac{\pi a \hbar^2}{m} \alpha_{\text{bb}} \approx \frac{\pi a \hbar^2}{m} 1.2. \quad (2b)$$

We neglect the frequency dependence in weak coupling, and thus the static induced interaction is

$$U_{\text{ind}}(0, \vec{q}) = -\frac{\pi a \hbar^2}{m} \frac{\alpha_{\text{fb}}^2}{\alpha_{\text{bb}}} \left[1 + \left(\frac{q}{2m_b c} \right)^2 \right]^{-1}, \quad (3)$$

where the speed of sound in the Bose gas is

$$c = \sqrt{n_b U_{\text{bb}} / m_b} = \hbar \sqrt{2\pi a n_b \alpha_{\text{bb}}} / m_b. \quad (4)$$

In weak coupling, the infrared behavior implies that momenta in the vicinity of the Fermi surface $|\vec{p}_i| = \hbar k_F$ dominate the pairing interaction. Moreover, the energy transfer is small, justifying our neglect of the frequency dependence. Pauli exclusion forbids S-wave induced interactions between the excess fermions, thus, the induced P-wave interaction is dominant. Projecting onto the Legendre polynomial $P_1(\cos \theta)$ with $\cos \theta =$

$1 - (\vec{p}_1 - \vec{p}_2)^2/(2k_F^2)$ leads to the P-wave component [13]

$$U_P = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{d \cos \theta}{2} \cos \theta U_{\text{ind}}(0, \vec{p}_1 - \vec{p}_2), \quad (5a)$$

$$= -\frac{\pi a \hbar^2}{m} \frac{\alpha_{\text{fb}}^2}{\alpha_{\text{bb}}} R_1 \left(\frac{\hbar k_F}{m_b c} \right), \quad (5b)$$

where

$$R_1(x) = \frac{2}{x^2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \ln(1 + x^2) - 1 \right]. \quad (6)$$

The asymmetry enters through the parameter

$$x^2 = \left(\frac{\hbar k_F}{m_b c} \right)^2 = \frac{3\pi}{\alpha_{\text{bb}}} \frac{n_F}{k_F a} \frac{n_F}{n_b}, \quad (7)$$

where $n_F = k_F^3/(6\pi^2)$ is the density of excess fermions. The function $R_1(x)$ has a maximum at $R(1.86) = 0.104$ and the following limiting behavior:

$$R_1(x) \rightarrow \begin{cases} x^2/6 & \text{where } x \ll 1, \\ \ln(x^2)/x^2 & \text{where } x \gg 1. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

For small asymmetries, $n_F/n_b \ll k_F a \ll 1$, we find the intriguing result that the P-wave gap is independent of the scattering length,

$$\frac{\Delta_P}{\varepsilon_F} \sim \exp \left(-\frac{4\alpha_{\text{bb}}^2 n_b}{\alpha_{\text{fb}}^2 n_F} \right) \sim \exp(-0.44 n_b/n_F), \quad (9)$$

although it is suppressed for small asymmetry. For large asymmetries, $n_F/n_b \gg k_F a$, the P-wave gap is

$$\frac{\Delta_P}{\varepsilon_F} \sim \exp \left(-\frac{6\pi^2}{\alpha_{\text{fb}}^2 (k_F a)^2 \ln(x^2)} \frac{n_F}{n_b} \right). \quad (10)$$

If we fix the interaction and density of excess fermions (constant a and k_F), we find a maximal P-wave gap as a function of the boson density:

$$\frac{\Delta_P^{\text{max}}}{\varepsilon_F} \sim \exp \left(-\frac{19.2 \pi \alpha_{\text{bb}}}{k_F a \alpha_{\text{fb}}^2} \right) \sim \exp \left(-\frac{5.6}{k_F a} \right), \quad (11)$$

for a small intermediate asymmetry:

$$n_F/n_b \approx 0.44 k_F a \ll 1. \quad (12)$$

Note that this maximal P-wave gap depends parametrically on $1/(k_F a)$ in the exponent as for S-wave pairing in the BCS regime. Therefore, we expect similar high critical temperatures towards resonance.

It is instructive to compare the critical temperature for P-wave superfluidity $T_c^P \sim \Delta_P$ to the critical temperature for Bose condensation of the molecules $T_c^{\text{BEC}} \sim$

$n_b^{2/3}/(\zeta(3/2)^{2/3}m_b)$. For the maximum P-wave gap, we find, with Eq. (11) and (12), the ratio

$$\frac{T_c^{\text{P, max}}}{T_c^{\text{BEC}}} \sim (k_F a)^{2/3} \exp\left(-\frac{5.6}{k_F a}\right), \quad (13)$$

which increases toward resonance. (Neglecting higher order effects, the prefactor may be calculated and is of order unity.) We therefore conclude that the P-wave superfluid/BEC phase P_1 may be observed in asymmetric Fermi gases as one approaches the S-wave Feshbach resonance from the BEC regime.

Our results are justified in weak coupling. The omitted pre-exponential factors, however, depend on higher-order induced interactions. It is expected that the resulting factors are of order unity. We also note that the pairing interaction induced by single phonon exchange is related to the effective mass $m^*/m = 1 + F_1/3$ through the Landau parameter $F_1 = -N_F U_P$. Effective mass corrections are thus higher order, but they would increase the density of states at the Fermi surface, and thus increase the magnitude of the P-wave gap and T_c^{P} .

BCS Regime. Next, we show that all proposed asymmetric Fermi liquid phases are unstable towards a two component P-wave superfluid due to the exchange of density fluctuations. This occurs in the BCS regime and is denoted by P_2 in our phase diagram Fig. 1. We start from a two component asymmetric Fermi gas with Fermi momenta $k_F^\uparrow > k_F^\downarrow$, and calculate the induced interactions in weak coupling. To lowest order in the S-wave interaction $4\pi a\hbar^2/m$, the induced interaction for back-to-back scattering is given by [27]:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{ind}}^{\uparrow\uparrow}(0, \vec{p}_1 - \vec{p}_2) &= \text{Diagram} \\ &= -N_F^\downarrow \left(\frac{4\pi a\hbar^2}{m}\right)^2 L(|\vec{p}_1 - \vec{p}_2|/(2\hbar k_F^\downarrow)). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The induced interaction for the minority fermions is obtained by interchanging the spin labels. As before, in weak coupling we neglect the frequency dependence and consider momenta on the Fermi surface. Thus, $L(y)$ denotes the static Lindhard function

$$L(y) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1-y^2}{4y} \ln \left| \frac{1+y}{1-y} \right|. \quad (15)$$

The importance of induced interactions for superfluidity has been pointed out for symmetric Fermi systems: in weak coupling for S-wave pairing [14], for P-wave pairing with repulsive interaction [15], and close to the Feshbach resonance [16] (based on [17]). In addition, it has been shown that induced interactions significantly suppress the superfluid gaps in neutron stars [18, 19]. For

P-wave pairing in neutron stars, it is known that central induced interactions are attractive [20], but repulsive spin-orbit fluctuations dominate this effect [19].

The resulting P-wave superfluid gap for the majority component is given by $\Delta_P^\uparrow \sim \varepsilon_F^\uparrow \exp[1/(N_F^\uparrow U_P^{\uparrow\uparrow})]$, where $U_P^{\uparrow\uparrow}$ denotes the P-wave projection of the induced interaction as in Eq. (5) [21]. This leads to

$$\frac{\Delta_P^\uparrow}{\varepsilon_F^\uparrow} \sim \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2}{4 k_F^\uparrow k_F^\downarrow a^2 L_1(k_F^\uparrow/k_F^\downarrow)}\right), \quad (16)$$

with the P-wave superfluid gap for the minority component given by interchanging the spin labels. The asymmetry enters through the function

$$L_1(z) = \frac{5z^2 - 2}{15z^4} \ln|1 - z^2| - \frac{z^2 + 5}{30z} \ln \left| \frac{1 - z}{1 + z} \right| - \frac{z^2 + 2}{15z^2},$$

which has the limiting behavior

$$L_1(z) \rightarrow \begin{cases} z^2/18 & \text{where } z \ll 1, \\ \kappa + (7 - 4 \ln 2)(z - 1)/15 & \text{where } z \approx 1, \\ 2 \ln(z)/(3z^2) & \text{where } z \gg 1. \end{cases}$$

For the symmetric case, we recover the result of [15], $\Delta_P \sim \varepsilon_F \exp[-\pi^2/(4 k_F^2 a^2 \kappa)]$, with $\kappa = (2 \ln 2 - 1)/5$, however, the work of [15] considered repulsive S-wave interactions. In our case, inter-species S-wave pairing will dominate for the symmetric system. The phase P_2 will start for some small but finite asymmetry, and the deviations in the exponent will be linear in $(z - 1)$.

For large asymmetries $k_F^\uparrow \gg k_F^\downarrow$, the P-wave gap of the majority component is

$$\frac{\Delta_P^\uparrow}{\varepsilon_F^\uparrow} \sim \exp\left(-\frac{3\pi^2}{2(2k_F^\downarrow a)^2 \ln(k_F^\uparrow/k_F^\downarrow)} \frac{k_F^\uparrow}{k_F^\downarrow}\right), \quad (17)$$

while that of the minority component is

$$\frac{\Delta_P^\downarrow}{\varepsilon_F^\downarrow} \sim \exp\left(-\frac{18\pi^2}{(2k_F^\downarrow a)^2} \frac{k_F^\uparrow}{k_F^\downarrow}\right). \quad (18)$$

The majority component has a larger gap, but both are suppressed for large asymmetry.

For fixed k_F^\downarrow , the minority gap Δ_P^\downarrow decreases monotonically for increasing asymmetry, while for fixed k_F^\uparrow , the majority gap Δ_P^\uparrow has a maximum at $k_F^\downarrow \approx 0.77 k_F^\uparrow$, due to the maximum of $L_1(z)/z = 0.11$ for $z = 1.3$:

$$\frac{\Delta_P^{\uparrow, \text{max}}}{\varepsilon_F^\uparrow} \sim \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2}{0.11(2k_F^\uparrow a)^2}\right). \quad (19)$$

Finally, we note that the P_2 phase does not destabilize LOFF, or similar phases, whose condensation energy is parametrically the same as that of the S-wave BCS phase where $\Delta_S \sim \exp(\pi/2 k_F a)$. Thus, the P-wave energy gain is parametrically smaller in weak coupling.

Discussion. Several asymmetric phases proposed in the literature contain Fermi surfaces, including the normal Fermi liquid phases as well as the gapless breached pair phases. Kohn and Luttinger [22] pointed out that, at zero temperature, *all* Fermi surfaces are unstable in the presence of interactions. We have shown that, in weak coupling, induced interactions lead to the formation of P-wave superfluids with maximal gaps for intermediate asymmetries. Thus, the suggested normal Fermi-liquid phases and breached pair phases are replaced by P-wave superfluids at zero temperature. In the asymptotic regions (both in asymmetry and coupling), the gaps are exponentially suppressed. The thermodynamic properties of these phases will thus still be dominated by their underlying Fermi-liquid/breached pair nature. However, the dependence of the P-wave gaps on the S-wave scattering length suggests that the induced P-wave superfluids may be observable as one approaches the Feshbach resonance, in particular from the BEC regime.

The nature of both phases $P_{1,2}$ is that of P-wave pairing between fermions of the *same* species with order parameter $\langle \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathbf{p}} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{-\mathbf{p}} \rangle \sim \Delta_P(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_m \Delta_m Y_{1,m}(\Omega_{\mathbf{p}})$. There are two qualitatively different states: one with two nodal points ($\Delta_P \sim Y_{1,\pm 1}$) that breaks time-reversal invariance, and one with a nodal plane ($\Delta_P \sim Y_{1,0}$). Energetic calculations suggest that the state with broken time-reversal is favored [23]. Both states spontaneously break rotational invariance, so the low-energy spectrum will include a new Nambu-Goldstone boson [24] in addition to the gapless nodes. In the P_2 phase, there may be interesting entrainment physics, since the two P-wave superfluids are coupled by the S-wave interaction.

As shown in Fig. 1, the phases $P_{1,2}$ will occupy shells in an optical trap at sufficiently low temperatures. As long as there is a finite molecular component n_b , a thin shell of the P_1 phase will always be realized. (The physical volume may be maximized by tuning the densities.) Observations of P_1 may also be facilitated by its occurrence in the BEC regime. The P_2 phase will occupy a large physical volume in the outer regions of the cloud containing an asymmetry in the BCS regime. One mechanism for detecting these phases would be to look for rotational asymmetries in the momentum distribution or pairwise correlations [25] in the time-of-flight expansion images of a single species. An interesting question is how the trap asymmetries would influence the spontaneously chosen orientation of the P-wave state.

We would especially like to thank George Bertsch for discussions concerning the P_2 phase. We also thank Anton Andreev and Dam Son for useful discussions. This work was supported by the US Department of Energy under Grant DE-FG02-97ER41014.

-
- * E-mail: bulgac@phys.washington.edu
 - † E-mail: mforbes@alum.mit.edu
 - ‡ E-mail: schwenk@u.washington.edu
 - [1] A.M. Clogston, Phys. Rev. Lett. **9**, 266 (1962).
 - [2] P. Fulde and R.A. Ferrell, Phys. Rev. **135**, A550 (1964); A.I. Larkin and Y.N. Ovchinnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 762 (1965).
 - [3] H. Mütter and A. Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 252503 (2002).
 - [4] W.V. Liu and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 047002 (2003); E. Gubankova, W.V. Liu, and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 032001 (2003); M.M. Forbes, E. Gubankova, W.V. Liu, and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 017001 (2005).
 - [5] C.H. Pao, S.-T. Wu, and S.K. Yip, Phys. Rev. **B73**, 132506 (2006).
 - [6] D.T. Son and M.A. Stephanov, cond-mat/0507586.
 - [7] D.E. Sheehy and L. Radzihovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 060401 (2006).
 - [8] M.W. Zwierlein, A. Schirotzek, C.H. Schunck, and W. Ketterle, Science **311**, 492 (2006).
 - [9] G.B. Partridge, W. Li, R.I. Kamar, Y.-a. Liao, and R.G. Hulet, Science **311**, 503 (2006).
 - [10] J. Carlson and S. Reddy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 060401 (2005).
 - [11] J. Bardeen, G. Baym, and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. **156**, 207 (1967); L. Viverit, C.J. Pethick, and H. Smith, Phys. Rev. **A61**, 053605 (2000).
 - [12] G.V. Skorniakov and K.A. Ter-Martirosian, Sov. Phys. JETP **4**, 648 (1957); D.S. Petrov, C. Salomon, and G.V. Shlyapnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 090404 (2004); A. Bulgac, P.F. Bedaque, and A.C. Fonseca, cond-mat/0306302.
 - [13] D.V. Efremov and L. Viverit, Phys. Rev. **B65**, 134519 (2002).
 - [14] L.P. Gorkov and T.K. Melik-Barkhudarov, Sov. Phys. JETP **13**, 1018 (1961); H. Heiselberg, C.J. Pethick, H. Smith, and L. Viverit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2418 (2000).
 - [15] D.V. Efremov, M.S. Marenko, M.A. Baranov, and M.Y. Kagan, Sov. Phys. JETP **90**, 861 (2000).
 - [16] S. Gaudio, J. Jackiewicz, and K.S. Bedell, cond-mat/0505306.
 - [17] S. Babu and G.E. Brown, Ann. Phys. (NY) **78**, 1 (1973).
 - [18] U. Lombardo and H.J. Schulze, Lect. Notes Phys. **578**, 30 (2001); A. Schwenk, B. Friman, and G.E. Brown, Nucl. Phys. **A713**, 191 (2003).
 - [19] A. Schwenk and B. Friman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 082501 (2004).
 - [20] C.J. Pethick and D.G. Ravenhall, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. **647**, 503 (1991).
 - [21] M.Yu. Kagan and A.V. Chubukov, JETP Lett. **50**, 517 (1989).
 - [22] W. Kohn and J.M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **15**, 524 (1965).
 - [23] P.W. Anderson and P. Morel, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1911 (1961).
 - [24] P.F. Bedaque, G. Rupak, and M.J. Savage, Phys. Rev. **C68**, 065802 (2003).
 - [25] E. Altman, E. Demler, and M.D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. **A70**, 013603 (2004); M. Greiner, C.A. Regal, J.T. Stewart, and

D.S. Jin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 110401 (2005).

- [26] To leading order in the interaction, the prefactor for the angle-averaged gap is $8/e^2$.
- [27] For pairing in the l -wave, the exchange contribution is

$-(1 + \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)/2 U_{\text{ind}}^{\uparrow\uparrow}(0, \vec{\mathbf{p}}_1 + \vec{\mathbf{p}}_2) \rightarrow -(-1)^{l+S+1} U_l$, which is implicitly included when solving a gap equation in the relevant partial wave.