

The Josephson relation for the superfluid density in the BCS-BEC crossover

Edward Taylor¹

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trento and CNR-INFM BEC Center, I-38050 Povo, Trento, Italy*
(Dated: September 9, 2019)

The Josephson relation for the superfluid density is derived for a Fermi superfluid in the BCS-BEC crossover. This new identity extends the original Josephson relation for Bose superfluids. It gives a simple exact relation between the superfluid density ρ_s and the broken-symmetry Cooper pair order parameter Δ_0 in terms of the infrared limit of the Cooper pair propagator. The same expression holds through the entire BCS-BEC crossover, describing the superfluid density of a weak-coupling BCS superfluid as well as the superfluid density of a Bose condensate of dimer molecules.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Hh, 03.75.Ss

I. INTRODUCTION

Josephson's relation^{1,2} has played an important role in developing an understanding of superfluidity since it establishes the connection between the two order parameters widely used to discuss Bose superfluids: the condensate density n_c and the superfluid density ρ_s . It provides an exact relation between these quantities in a Bose superfluid in terms of the infrared behaviour of the single-particle Green's function $D_{11}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m)$ for bosons of mass m_B :

$$\rho_s = - \lim_{\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0} \frac{n_c m_B^2}{\mathbf{q}^2 D_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0)}. \quad (1)$$

The simple structure of Eq. (1) has enabled a detailed analysis to be carried out of the superfluid transition in both three-^{1,3} and two-dimensional⁴ Bose superfluids. This includes finite-size systems where it has been used⁴ to answer the important question of whether the superfluid transition observed in *quasi* two-dimensional trapped Bose gases⁵ is a Kosterlitz-Thouless-Berezinskii⁶ transition or Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC).

Recently, Holzmann and Baym have extended the original phenomenological arguments of Josephson and given a microscopic proof of Eq. (1) using diagrammatic perturbation theory.⁷ This proof extends earlier discussions by Bogoliubov,⁸ Gavoret and Nozières,⁹ and Hohenberg and Martin¹⁰ at $T = 0$ where $\rho_s = mn$. A discussion of the Josephson relation for a Bose superfluid at finite temperatures is given by Griffin¹¹ using the dielectric diagrammatic formalism (see also Wong and Gould¹²).

Following Holzmann and Baym, in this paper the analogous exact relation for a two-component *Fermi* superfluid is proven. This gives the relationship between the superfluid density and the order parameter Δ_0 that represents the Bose-condensate of Cooper pairs of fermions. The Josephson relation derived in this paper is analyzed in the BCS-BEC crossover^{13,14,15} picture of Fermi superfluids, widely studied in recent years in the context of ultracold atomic gases.^{16,17,18,19} In the BEC limit of this crossover, where the attractive interaction between the two species of fermions is strong, the Cooper pairs reduce to dimer molecules. In this limit, the expression

obtained for ρ_s reduces to the usual Josephson relation for a Bose superfluid in Eq. (1).

As with the derivations for a Bose superfluid in Refs. 7, 8,9,10,11, the derivation given below for a uniform system is based on *exact* two-fermion propagators, and is not approximate.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Consider a two-component Fermi gas (e.g., neutral Fermi atoms prepared in two different hyperfine states) with *s*-wave interactions between the two components, described by the Hamiltonian density (in this paper, \hbar and also the volume V are set to unity)

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\sigma} \bar{\psi}_{\sigma}(x) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} - \mu \right) \psi_{\sigma}(x) - U_0 \bar{\psi}_{\uparrow}(x) \bar{\psi}_{\downarrow}(x) \psi_{\downarrow}(x) \psi_{\uparrow}(x). \quad (2)$$

The two components are denoted by $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ and the pseudopotential interaction parameter U_0 is related to the *s*-wave scattering length a_s by

$$\frac{1}{U_0} = -\frac{m_F}{4\pi a_s} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{m_F}{\mathbf{k}^2}, \quad (3)$$

where m_F is the fermion mass. The entire BCS-BEC crossover can be probed by “tuning” the *s*-wave scattering length from small and negative (BCS limit) through unitarity ($|a_s| = \infty$), and finally into the BEC limit where a_s is small and positive.

Although only the case of *s*-wave interactions between fermions is considered in this paper, the analysis given below can be extended to deal with a more general pairing interaction, as well as Hubbard-type Hamiltonians that describe fermions in a lattice.

The derivation of a Josephson relation for Fermi superfluids given in this paper makes use of the structure of the grand canonical thermodynamic potential $\Omega[v_s]$ of a current-carrying Fermi superfluid to identify the change in the free energy of a superfluid when a velocity is imposed on the condensate order parameter. The superfluid

density for a superfluid with velocity v_s is then obtained from

$$\rho_s = \left(\frac{\partial^2 \Omega[v_s]}{\partial v_s^2} \right)_{\mu, \Delta_0} \Big|_{v_s=0}. \quad (4)$$

It can be shown²⁰ that this is equivalent to the standard definition²¹

$$\rho_s = \frac{\partial^2 F[v_s]}{\partial v_s^2} \Big|_{v_s=0} \quad (5)$$

given in terms of the free energy $F = \Omega + \mu n$. One can also prove (see Appendix A in Ref. 20) that Eq. (4) is equivalent to $\rho_s = \rho - \rho_n$, where the normal fluid density ρ_n is given in terms of the transverse current correlation function.² Explicitly, for superfluid flow along the z -axis,

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \Omega[v_s]}{\partial v_s^2} \right)_{\mu, \Delta_0} \Big|_{v_s=0} = \rho - m \langle \hat{J}_z \hat{J}_z \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where \hat{J}_z is the component of the total current operator in the z -direction.

Microscopically, the thermodynamic potential is given by the partition function \mathcal{Z} ,

$$\Omega = -\beta^{-1} \ln \mathcal{Z}, \quad (7)$$

where $\beta \equiv (k_B T)^{-1}$. Functional integral techniques allow us to express the partition function as a functional integral over fermionic Grassmann fields ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ as²²

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}[\psi, \bar{\psi}] e^{-S[\psi, \bar{\psi}]}. \quad (8)$$

The imaginary-time action $S[\psi, \bar{\psi}]$ in Eq. (8) for a two-component Fermi superfluid is given by

$$S[\psi, \bar{\psi}] = \int d^4x \left[\sum_{\sigma} \bar{\psi}_{\sigma}(x) \partial_{\tau} \psi_{\sigma}(x) + \mathcal{H} \right], \quad (9)$$

where the Hamiltonian density \mathcal{H} is given by Eq. (2). Here, $x = (\mathbf{r}, \tau)$ is used to denote the spatial coordinate \mathbf{r} and the imaginary time $\tau = it$, and $\int d^4x \equiv \int_0^{\beta} d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}$.

A central aspect of the analysis in this paper (and that of Josephson¹) is the existence of a broken-symmetry order parameter in the superfluid phase. For Fermi superfluids, this order parameter Δ_0 is given by the anomalous average

$$\Delta_0 \equiv \frac{U_0}{\beta} \sum_k \langle c_{\downarrow, -k} c_{\uparrow, k} \rangle. \quad (10)$$

Here, $c_{\sigma, k}$ is the Fourier-transform of the Fermi Grassmann field $\psi_{\sigma}(x)$,

$$\psi_{\sigma}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} \sum_k c_{\sigma, k} e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad (11)$$

where $k \equiv (\mathbf{k}, \omega_n)$ is a 4-vector for the wavevector \mathbf{k} and Fermi Matsubara frequency $\omega_n = \pi(2n+1)/\beta$, $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, and $k \cdot x \equiv \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r} - \omega_n \tau$.

In order to introduce the bosonic order parameter into the partition function \mathcal{Z} , the following identity is used:

$$e^{U_0 \int d^4x \bar{\psi}_{\uparrow} \bar{\psi}_{\downarrow} \psi_{\downarrow} \psi_{\uparrow}} = \int \mathcal{D}[\Delta, \Delta^*] \times \exp \left\{ - \int d^4x \left[\frac{|\Delta|^2}{U_0} - (\Delta^* \psi_{\downarrow} \psi_{\uparrow} + \Delta \bar{\psi}_{\uparrow} \bar{\psi}_{\downarrow}) \right] \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Substituting this into Eq. (8), one obtains the result

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z} &= \int \mathcal{D}[\psi, \bar{\psi}] \mathcal{D}[\Delta, \Delta^*] \times \\ &\exp \left\{ - \int d^4x \left[\sum_{\sigma} \bar{\psi}_{\sigma}(x) \left(\partial_{\tau} - \frac{\nabla^2}{2m} - \mu \right) \psi_{\sigma}(x) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \Delta^* \psi_{\downarrow} \psi_{\uparrow} - \Delta \bar{\psi}_{\uparrow} \bar{\psi}_{\downarrow} + \frac{|\Delta|^2}{U_0} \right] \right\} \\ &\equiv \int \mathcal{D}[\psi, \bar{\psi}] \mathcal{D}[\Delta, \Delta^*] e^{-S_{\text{eff}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

This integral identity (the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation) only introduces an auxiliary Bose field $\Delta(x)$, and no approximation has been made. It is straightforward to show that the static, uniform component of this field gives the order parameter defined in Eq. (10). That is, using the partition function in Eq. (13), one can show that

$$\langle \Delta(x) \rangle = \frac{U_0}{\beta} \sum_k \langle c_{\downarrow, -k} c_{\uparrow, k} \rangle \equiv \Delta_0, \quad (14)$$

where the equilibrium average $\langle \Delta(x) \rangle$ is defined by

$$\langle \Delta(x) \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \int \mathcal{D}[\psi, \bar{\psi}] \mathcal{D}[\Delta, \Delta^*] \Delta(x) e^{-S_{\text{eff}}}. \quad (15)$$

It is important to emphasize that while the BCS order parameter Δ_0 is usually calculated in the mean-field BCS approximation, it is not an inherently mean-field quantity. The “0” subscript on Δ_0 only denotes the fact that the order parameter is related to the average occupation (macroscopic in the superfluid phase) of a pair state with zero total momentum. One obtains the mean-field approximation for Δ_0 if the expectation value $\langle \dots \rangle$ in Eq. (14) is evaluated using a mean-field expression for the partition function. Here the full partition function is used, so Δ_0 is the *exact* value of the order parameter.

Having established the relation between the auxiliary Bose field $\Delta(x)$ and the order parameter in Eq. (14), $\Delta(x)$ can be separated as

$$\Delta(x) = \Delta_0 + \Lambda(x), \quad (16)$$

where $\Lambda(x)$ represents the fluctuations out of the static Bose-condensed pair state.

The partition function given by Eq. (13) and the identity in Eq. (16) will be used below to analyze the superfluid density in a current-carrying Fermi superfluid. First we examine the *Cooper pair propagator* that describes the dynamics of the Bose field $\Delta(x)$

III. THE COOPER PAIR PROPAGATOR

The key correlation function of interest in the study of the dynamics of Cooper pairs is the 2×2 matrix Cooper pair propagator $\mathbf{L}(x, x')$ that describes the propagation of the Bose field $\Delta(x)$. It is conveniently defined in terms of its inverse \mathbf{L}^{-1} , with matrix elements given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11}(x, x') &\equiv -\frac{1}{U_0}\delta(x - x') + \Pi_{11}(x, x') \\ &= (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{22}(x', x) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12}(x, x') &\equiv \Pi_{12}(x, x'), \\ (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{21}(x, x') &\equiv \Pi_{21}(x, x'). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here the matrix polarization operator $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is defined by²³

$$\mathbf{\Pi}(x, x') \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \langle \bar{\Phi}(x)\Phi(x') \rangle & \langle \Phi(x)\Phi(x') \rangle \\ \langle \bar{\Phi}(x)\bar{\Phi}(x') \rangle & \langle \Phi(x)\bar{\Phi}(x') \rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\bar{\Phi}(x) \equiv \bar{\psi}_\uparrow(x)\bar{\psi}_\downarrow(x), \quad \Phi(x) \equiv \psi_\downarrow(x)\psi_\uparrow(x). \quad (20)$$

Using Eqs. (17) and (18), the Cooper pair propagator is given explicitly by

$$\mathbf{L} \equiv -\frac{U_0}{(1 - U_0\Pi_{11})(1 - U_0\Pi_{22}) - U_0^2\Pi_{12}\Pi_{21}} \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 - U_0\Pi_{22} & U_0\Pi_{12} \\ U_0\Pi_{21} & 1 - U_0\Pi_{11} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

The Cooper pair propagator can be viewed as the propagator for a single composite boson (the Cooper pair) and hence, is the analogue of the single-boson Green's function \mathbf{D} . It should be stressed, however, that it is distinct from the two-fermion Green's function $\mathbf{\Pi}$, as can be seen from Eq. (21). Nevertheless, as discussed in Ref. 24, evaluating the Cooper pair propagator at the mean-field BCS level (equal to the BCS approximation for the many-body T -matrix in Ref. 24), one can show that \mathbf{L} reduces to the single-particle Bose Green's function [within the Bogoliubov approximation; see Eq. (60)] for a dimer condensate in the BEC limit of the BCS-BEC crossover. From this point of view, \mathbf{L} is seen to be the natural analogue in a Fermi superfluid of the Bose Green's function \mathbf{D} . Further discussion of the Cooper pair propagator in the BCS approximation is given in Sec. V.

Anticipating this similarity to the Bose Green's function \mathbf{D} , the Fourier transform $\mathbf{L}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m)$ of the inverse Cooper pair propagator is expanded in powers of q as²⁵

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) &= (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{22}(\mathbf{q}, -\nu_m) = A(i\nu_m) - B - C\mathbf{q}^2 + \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{q}^4, \nu_m^2), \\ (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) &= (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{21}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) = -D - F\mathbf{q}^2 + \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{q}^4, \nu_m^2), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where, $\nu_m = 2\pi m/\beta$, $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$ denotes the Bose Matsubara frequencies. Using this expansion, the Cooper pair propagator becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) &= \frac{1}{A(i\nu_m - \omega_{\mathbf{q}})(i\nu_m + \omega_{\mathbf{q}})} \times \\ &\left(\begin{array}{cc} i\nu_m + \frac{B}{A} + \frac{C}{A}\mathbf{q}^2 & -\frac{D}{A} - \frac{F}{A}\mathbf{q}^2 \\ -\frac{D}{A} - \frac{F}{A}\mathbf{q}^2 & -i\nu_m + \frac{B}{A} + \frac{C}{A}\mathbf{q}^2 \end{array} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{q}^4, \nu_m^2), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we have defined the poles of \mathbf{L} as

$$\omega_{\mathbf{q}} \equiv \frac{1}{A}\sqrt{(B + C\mathbf{q}^2)^2 - (D + F\mathbf{q}^2)^2}. \quad (24)$$

This shows that in order for the poles of the Cooper pair propagator to be gapless, we must have $B = D$, giving a Bogoliubov-Anderson mode with velocity

$$v = \frac{1}{A}\sqrt{2B(C - F)}. \quad (25)$$

While the expansion in Eq. (22) is useful for understanding the structure of \mathbf{L} , it must be emphasized that this expansion is only valid when \mathbf{L} is an analytic function of \mathbf{q} . While we expect this to be the case in three dimensions, it is not true in two dimensions, for instance. In two dimensions, the Cooper pair propagator decays algebraically below the Kosterlitz-Thouless-Berezinskii transition temperature: $\mathbf{L}(x, x') \propto |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|^{-\eta}$. In this case, $L_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0) \propto \mathbf{q}^{-2+\eta}$ as $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0$,⁴ and the elements of \mathbf{L}^{-1} depend on \mathbf{q} in a nonanalytic way. This dependence must be separated out before a small- \mathbf{q} expansion can be performed.

IV. THE CURRENT-CARRYING SUPERFLUID

We now consider the properties of a current-carrying superfluid. To introduce a finite superfluid velocity v_s , a "phase twist"²¹ is applied to the Bose order parameter Δ_0 defined in Eq. (10):

$$\Delta_0 \rightarrow \Delta_0 e^{im_B \mathbf{v}_s \cdot \mathbf{r}}. \quad (26)$$

Here, $m_B \equiv 2m_F$ is the mass of the Cooper pair. Expanding the Bose pairing field $\Delta(x)$ about the uniform, static value of the order parameter Δ_0 as in Eq. (16) and applying the phase twist, one finds

$$\Delta(x) \rightarrow \Delta_0 e^{im_B \mathbf{v}_s \cdot \mathbf{r}} + \Lambda(x) = \Delta(x) + \Delta_0 (e^{im_B \mathbf{v}_s \cdot \mathbf{r}} - 1). \quad (27)$$

Writing the dependence on the superfluid velocity \mathbf{v}_s in this way emphasizes that the proceeding analysis is based on the full Bose pairing field $\Delta(x)$ that includes all fluctuations about the static order parameter Δ_0 .

Using Eq. (27) in Eq. (13), it is seen that the effect of imposing a phase twist on the order parameter is to generate a new term in the effective action:

$$S_{\text{eff}}[v_s] = S_{\text{eff}}[0] + \delta S[v_s], \quad (28)$$

where

$$\delta S = -\Delta_0 \int d^4x [(e^{im_B \mathbf{v}_s \cdot \mathbf{r}} - 1) \bar{\Phi}(x) + (e^{-im_B \mathbf{v}_s \cdot \mathbf{r}} - 1) \Phi(x)], \quad (29)$$

and $\Phi, \bar{\Phi}$ are defined in Eq. (20). Note that the term in the effective action S_{eff} in Eq. (13) involving $|\Delta(x)|^2/U_0$ is unchanged by the phase twist to the order parameter since the imaginary-time integral over any term linear in $\Lambda(x)$ vanishes.

Using Eq. (28) in the partition function defined in Eq. (13), the thermodynamic potential of the current-carrying superfluid is found to be

$$\Omega[v_s] = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \int \mathcal{D}[\psi, \bar{\psi}] \mathcal{D}[\Delta, \Delta^*] e^{-S_{\text{eff}}[0] - \delta S[v_s]}. \quad (30)$$

Applying the definition of the superfluid density given by Eq. (4) to Eq. (30), after a small amount of algebra one finds

$$\rho_s = \frac{1}{\beta} \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 \delta S}{\partial v_s^2} \right\rangle - \frac{1}{\beta} \left\langle \left(\frac{\partial \delta S}{\partial v_s} \right)^2 \right\rangle. \quad (31)$$

Here, $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes the equilibrium average in the current-free state, given by

$$\langle \dots \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}[0]} \int \mathcal{D}[\psi, \bar{\psi}] \mathcal{D}[\Delta, \Delta^*] (\dots) e^{-S_{\text{eff}}[0]}. \quad (32)$$

Note that $\langle (\partial \delta S / \partial v_s) |_{v_s=0} \rangle = 0$, by symmetry.

Using Eq. (29) to evaluate Eq. (31) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s &= \frac{\Delta_0 m_B^2}{\beta} \int d^4x \langle \bar{\Phi}(x) + \Phi(x) \rangle (\hat{\mathbf{v}}_s \cdot \mathbf{r})^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta_0^2 m_B^2}{\beta} \int d^4x d^4x' [\Pi_{11} + \Pi_{22} - \Pi_{12} - \Pi_{21}](x, x') \\ &\quad \times (\hat{\mathbf{v}}_s \cdot \mathbf{r})(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_s \cdot \mathbf{r}'), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_s \equiv \mathbf{v}_s/v_s$ and $\Pi_{ij}(x, x')$ denote the elements of the matrix polarization operator defined in Eq. (19). Making use of the identity

$$\langle \bar{\Phi}(x) \rangle = \langle \Phi(x) \rangle = \frac{\Delta_0}{U_0}, \quad (34)$$

Eq. (33) is naturally given in terms of the inverse Cooper pair propagator,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s &= -\frac{\Delta_0^2 m_B^2}{\beta} \int d^4x d^4x' [(\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11} + (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{22} - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12} \\ &\quad - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{21}](x, x') (\hat{\mathbf{v}}_s \cdot \mathbf{r})(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_s \cdot \mathbf{r}'). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Fourier transforming this expression, one finds (taking $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_s = \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ to lie along the z -axis)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s &= -\frac{\Delta_0^2 m_B^2}{2} \lim_{\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q_z^2} [(\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11} + (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{22} - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12} \\ &\quad - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{21}](\mathbf{q}, 0), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

with static matrix elements $(\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{ij}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m = 0)$. In addition to Eq. (36), Fourier-transforming Eq. (35), one finds a divergent term that can be set to zero. A more careful treatment of the phase-twist in Eq. (26) that employs anti-periodic boundary conditions (see the discussion in Ref. 21) shows that this divergent term is in fact zero.

Using the expansion in Eq. (22) to evaluate the the second-order derivative in Eq. (36), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial q_z^2} [(\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11} + (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{22} - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12} - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{21}](\mathbf{q}, 0) \\ = 4F - 4C. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

This allows us to write Eq. (36) more compactly as

$$\rho_s = 2\Delta_0^2 m_B^2 (C - F). \quad (38)$$

Now, from the static 1,1-matrix element $L_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0)$ in Eq. (23), one also finds

$$\lim_{\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}^2 L_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0)} = \lim_{\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0} \frac{[D^2 - B^2 + 2(DF - BC)\mathbf{q}^2]}{B\mathbf{q}^2}. \quad (39)$$

Assuming that \mathbf{L} has a gapless excitation spectrum (such that $B = D$), this reduces to

$$\lim_{\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}^2 L_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0)} = 2F - 2C. \quad (40)$$

Comparing Eqs. (38) and (40), one finally obtains

$$\rho_s = -\lim_{\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta_0^2 m_B^2}{\mathbf{q}^2 L_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0)}. \quad (41)$$

This expression gives the precise analogue for Fermi superfluids of the Josephson relation for Bose superfluids in Eq. (1). We see that the single-particle Green's function \mathbf{D} for bosons has been replaced by the Cooper pair propagator \mathbf{L} , and the square of the BCS order parameter Δ_0^2 plays the role of the square of the order parameter

$$\Phi_0^2 \equiv |\langle \psi \rangle|^2 = n_c \quad (42)$$

of a Bose superfluid.

For a Bose superfluid, Eq. (42) gives a simple relation between the order parameter Φ_0 and the condensate density n_c , and these two quantities can be interchanged in the Josephson relation in Eq. (1). This is not the case in a Fermi superfluid, however, where the condensate density is not a simple function of the order parameter Δ_0 . This can be seen from the mean-field expression for the condensate density in a BCS superfluid, given by²⁶

$$n_c = \frac{1}{\beta^2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \omega_n, \omega'_n} G_{0,21}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n) G_{0,12}(\mathbf{k}, \omega'_n), \quad (43)$$

where \mathbf{G}_0 is the mean-field 2×2 matrix BCS Green's function. Equation (41) emphasizes the direct role of the

order parameter in Josephson's relation, in contrast to the indirect role played by the condensate density.

Equation (41) gives an *exact* relation between the superfluid density ρ_s and the order parameter Δ_0 in terms of the static Cooper pair propagator \mathbf{L} . It can immediately be used to study superfluidity in Fermi superfluids. As discussed at the end of Sec. III, however, since it is based on the expansion in Eq. (22), Eq. (41) is only valid when $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{q}, 0)$ is an analytic function of \mathbf{q} . An analysis of superfluidity in two dimensions (where \mathbf{L} is not analytic) should thus be based on Eq. (36), which makes no assumptions about analyticity.

In practice, Eq. (36) and equivalently, Eq. (38), are easier to evaluate than Eq. (41) since the inverse Cooper propagator is given directly in terms of $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and it is this latter quantity that we want to evaluate using diagrammatic perturbation theory. In Sec. V, Eq. (38) is studied within the BCS approximation for $\mathbf{\Pi}$. We see how the resulting expression for the superfluid density reduces to the well-known Landau formula for BCS quasiparticle excitations.

V. APPROXIMATIONS FOR THE COOPER PAIR PROPAGATOR

In order to calculate the superfluid density in a Fermi superfluid using Eq. (38), some approximation must be made for the static inverse pair propagator $\mathbf{L}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, 0)$. The simplest approximation is the BCS mean-field approximation, where (schematically) $\mathbf{\Pi} = G_0 G_0$. Using this in Eqs. (17) and (18) gives

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0) &= (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{22}(\mathbf{q}, 0) = \\ &-\frac{1}{U_0} - \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \omega_n} G_{0,11}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n) G_{0,22}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}, \omega_n) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12}(\mathbf{q}, 0) &= (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{21}(\mathbf{q}, 0) = \\ &-\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \omega_n} G_{0,12}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n) G_{0,12}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}, \omega_n). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

In this approximation, \mathbf{L}^{-1} is equivalent to the negative of the inverse pair fluctuation propagator \mathbf{M} defined in Refs. 20,27. Reference 27 showed explicitly that the poles of \mathbf{L} describe the gapless (i.e., $B = D$) Bogoliubov-Anderson spectrum at small \mathbf{q} throughout the entire BCS-BEC crossover. Furthermore, the combination of inverse matrix elements

$$(\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11}(\mathbf{q}, 0) - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12}(\mathbf{q}, 0) = -(C - F)\mathbf{q}^2 + \dots \quad (46)$$

that enters the expression for the superfluid density in Eqs. (36) and (38) is proportional to the static inverse propagator for the *phase* fluctuations of the order parameter.²⁸

Evaluating the second-order derivative of Eqs. (44) and (45) with respect to q_z , after some lengthy but straightforward algebra, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} C - F &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{4E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \left[\frac{1-2f}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} \right] g(\mathbf{k}) \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2}{4E_{\mathbf{k}}^3} \left(\frac{k_z}{m_F} \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $f = [\exp(\beta E_{\mathbf{k}}) + 1]^{-1}$ is the Fermi thermal distribution for BCS quasiparticles of energy $E_{\mathbf{k}} = \sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta_0^2}$, k_z is the z -component of \mathbf{k} , and $g(\mathbf{k})$ is defined by

$$g(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}}{m_F} - \left(\frac{k_z}{m_F} \right)^2 \left[1 - 3 \frac{\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \right]. \quad (48)$$

Note that Eq. (47) is the finite-temperature generalization of the Q coefficient defined in Ref. 27.

Substituting Eq. (47) into Eq. (38) gives the following mean-field expression for the superfluid density in the BCS-BEC crossover:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s &= 2m_F^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \left[\frac{1-2f}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} \right] g(\mathbf{k}) \\ &+ 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^3} k_z^2. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Using

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} = \frac{m_F E_{\mathbf{k}}}{k \xi_{\mathbf{k}}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial k} \quad (50)$$

and integrating by parts, Eq. (49) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s &= 2m_F^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}^3} (1-2f)g(\mathbf{k}) + 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^4}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^4} \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} k_z^2 \\ &= 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \left[\frac{1-2f}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} \right] k_z^2 \\ &+ 2m_F \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}^3} (1-2f) \left[\xi_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{k_z^2}{m_F} \left(\frac{3\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} - 2 \right) \right] \\ &- 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2 \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^4} \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} k_z^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Applying Eq. (50) to the last line and integrating by parts again, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s &= 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \left[\frac{1-2f}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} \right] k_z^2 \\ &+ 2m_F \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}^3} \left[\xi_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{k_z^2}{m_F} \left(\frac{3\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} - 2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The integral in the second line can be evaluated analytically and is found to vanish. Equation (49) has thus been reduced to

$$\rho_s = 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \left[\frac{1-2f}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} \right] k_z^2. \quad (53)$$

Rearranging the mean-field expression for the mass density ρ using integration by parts and Eq. (50) (see the related discussion in Ref. 16),

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= m_F \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[1 - \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}}{E_{\mathbf{k}}} (1 - 2f) \right] \\ &= -m_F \sum_{\mathbf{k}} k_z \frac{\partial}{\partial k_z} \left[1 - \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}}{E_{\mathbf{k}}} (1 - 2f) \right] \\ &= 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \frac{1 - 2f}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}} k_z^2 - 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2}{E_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} k_z^2, \quad (54)\end{aligned}$$

Eq. (53) can be written as

$$\rho_s = \rho + 2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} k_z^2. \quad (55)$$

This is precisely Landau's formula for the superfluid density of a BCS Fermi superfluid,²⁹ corresponding to a normal fluid of Fermi BCS quasiparticles.

Thus, we see how the mean-field approximation given by Eq. (44) and (45) for the exact expression in Eq. (38) gives us Landau's formula for the superfluid density in a BCS superfluid. Being mean-field, this result does not incorporate the effect of bosonic fluctuations²⁰ and consequently, is not a good approximation outside the BCS and BEC limits, where interactions are weak.

In the BEC limit of tightly-bound pairs (a_s small and positive), the chemical potential becomes large and negative, roughly equal to half the dimer binding energy:²⁷ $\mu = -1/2m_F a_s^2$. In this case, $|\mu| \gg \Delta_0, k_B T$; $f \rightarrow 0$, and Eq. (53) reduces to

$$\rho_s(T) \simeq \frac{2m_B^3 \Delta_0^2(T) a_s}{64\pi}. \quad (56)$$

Equation (43) can also be solved analytically in the BEC limit to give the condensate density of dimer molecules,^{26,30}

$$n_c(T) \simeq \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\Delta_0^2(T)}{4\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \simeq \left(\frac{m_F^2 a_s}{8\pi} \right) \Delta_0^2(T). \quad (57)$$

Using Eq. (57) in Eq. (56) gives the following well-known mean-field expression for the superfluid density in the BEC limit:

$$\rho_s(T) = m_B n_c(T). \quad (58)$$

Within the same mean-field approximation [given by Eqs. (44) and (45)], one can show in the BEC limit that the inverse Cooper pair propagator \mathbf{L}^{-1} reduces to^{24,31}

$$\mathbf{L}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) = \left(\frac{m_F^2 a_s}{8\pi} \right) \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m), \quad (59)$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} i\nu_m - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{q}} - n_c U_{\text{mol}} & -n_c U_{\text{mol}} \\ -n_c U_{\text{mol}} & -i\nu_m - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{q}} - n_c U_{\text{mol}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (60)$$

is the inverse single-particle Green's function for the Bose-condensed dimer molecules, analogous to the Green's function that enters Eq. (1). Here, $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{q}^2/2m_B$ while $U_{\text{mol}} = 4\pi(2a_s)/m_B$ is the mean-field interaction between dimers, predicting a dimer scattering length of $a_{\text{mol}} = 2a_s$ ²⁷ instead of the exact result $a_{\text{mol}} = 0.6a_s$.³² Substituting Eqs. (57) and (59) into Eq. (41), one immediately obtains the Josephson relation in Eq. (1) for a condensate of dimer molecules.

Of course, one expects Eq. (41) to reduce to Eq. (1) in the BEC limit at any level of approximation, and not just at the mean-field level at which Eqs. (59) and (60) have been derived. The fact that Eq. (59) is a mean-field result only means that the molecular self-energies $\Sigma_{ij}^{\text{mol}}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m)$ that enter the dimer Green's function \mathbf{D}^{-1} in Eq. (60) are mean-field. Explicitly, writing down the exact single-particle Green's function for a dimer molecule,

$$\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} i\nu_m - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{q}} + \mu_{\text{mol}} - \Sigma_{11}^{\text{mol}} & -\Sigma_{12}^{\text{mol}} \\ -\Sigma_{21}^{\text{mol}} & -i\nu_m - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{q}} + \mu_{\text{mol}} - \Sigma_{22}^{\text{mol}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (61)$$

Eq. (60) corresponds to the result

$$\mu_{\text{mol}} - \Sigma_{11}^{\text{mol}}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) = -n_c U_{\text{mol}} \quad (62)$$

and

$$\Sigma_{12}^{\text{mol}}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m) = n_c U_{\text{mol}}. \quad (63)$$

Beyond the failure of these mean-field self-energies to correctly reproduce the two-body scattering length, they are independent of the momentum \mathbf{q} . Using Eq. (61) in Eq. (1) shows that such a momentum-independent self-energy will always lead to the mean-field result for ρ_s in Eq. (58).

Going beyond the mean-field BCS approximation, the Nozières-Schmitt-Rink³³ theory for the superfluid phase²⁷ amounts to replacing \mathbf{G}_0 in Eqs. (44) and (45) by the first term in the expansion of the Dyson equation:

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_0 + \mathbf{G}_0 \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{G}_0, \quad (64)$$

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is the appropriate fermion self-energy matrix.^{34,35,36} One can use the resulting expression for \mathbf{L} to obtain the "Gaussian fluctuation" expression for the superfluid density. It would be interesting to compare the results of using this and other approximation schemes^{36,37,38} for \mathbf{G} to evaluate the superfluid density and compare with existing calculations in the literature.^{26,38}

VI. SUMMARY

Josephson's relation¹ for Bose superfluids gave the first explicit identity connecting the two key order parameters in the theory of superfluids: the broken-symmetry order

parameter and the superfluid density. It is remarkable that such a simple relation exists between two such different quantities: the superfluid density that describes the response of a system to a transverse current probe, as in Eq. (6), and the order-parameter in a Bose superfluid, associated with the macroscopic occupation of a single-particle state. Extending the recent analysis by Holzmann and Baym,⁷ the analogous identity has been derived for a two-component s -wave Fermi superfluid. This gives an exact relation between the superfluid density ρ_s and the BCS order parameter Δ_0 in terms of the infrared limit of the static Cooper pair propagator $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m = 0)$.

Using the simplest theory (mean-field BCS) to evaluate the Cooper pair propagator, we have seen that the Josephson relation reduces to Landau's formula for the superfluid density of a Fermi gas with BCS quasiparticle excitations. At first glance, it might seem surprising that the Josephson relation—which expresses the superfluid density in terms of the propagator for *collective phase fluctuations*—manages to reproduce this Landau formula for a normal fluid of *single-particle* Fermi BCS excitations. However, this propagator is actually a

correlation function for the *gradient* of the phase of the order parameter,³⁹ and consequently, is directly related to the current correlation function.² In turn, Landau's formula can be obtained by a direct evaluation of the longitudinal and transverse components of the current correlation function within the BCS approximation.⁴⁰

The simple structure of the Josephson relation derived in this paper should simplify the calculation of the superfluid density using the standard tools of diagrammatic perturbation theory to evaluate the pair propagator \mathbf{L} . It also opens the way to giving a rigorous analysis of the superfluid transition in Fermi systems, along the lines of those given for Bose superfluids.^{1,3,4}

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank A. Griffin and L. P. Pitaevskii for many illuminating discussions, and also M. Holzmann for clarifying some details of Ref. 7.

-
- ¹ B. D. Josephson, Phys. Lett. **21**, 608 (1966).
² G. Baym in *Mathematical Methods in Solid State and Superfluid Theory*, edited by R. C. Clark and G. H. Derrick (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1969), p. 121.
³ M. Holzmann and G. Baym, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 040402 (2003).
⁴ M. Holzmann, G. Baym, J.-P. Blaizot, and F. Laloë, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 10.1073/pnas.0609957104 (2007).
⁵ S. Stock, Z. Hadzibabic, B. Batterlier, M. Cheneau, and J. Dalibard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 190403; P. Krüger, Z. Hadzibabic, and J. Dalibard, cond-mat/0703200.
⁶ V. L. Berezinskii, Sov. Phys. JETP **34**, 610 (1972); J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **7**, 1047 (1974).
⁷ M. Holzmann and G. Baym, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 092502 (2007).
⁸ N. N. Bogoliubov, *Lectures on Quantum Statistics, Vol. 2* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1970).
⁹ J. Gavoret and P. Nozières, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **28**, 349 (1964).
¹⁰ P. C. Hohenberg and P. C. Martin, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **34**, 291 (1965).
¹¹ A. Griffin, *Excitations in a Bose-Condensed Liquid* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
¹² V. K. Wong and H. Gould, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **83**, 252 (1974).
¹³ D. M. Eagles, Phys. Rev. **186**, 456 (1969).
¹⁴ A. J. Leggett, J. Phys. C **41**, 7 (1980).
¹⁵ M. Randeria in *Bose-Einstein Condensation*, edited by A. Griffin, D. Snoke, and S. Stringari (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).
¹⁶ Q. Chen, J. Stajic, S. Tan, and K. Levin, Phys. Rep. **412**, 1 (2005).
¹⁷ S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Rev. Mod. Phys. (to be published).
¹⁸ R. Grimm, in *Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi" - Course CLXIV "Ultra-Cold Fermi Gases"*, Varenna, June 2006, edited by M. Inguscio, W. Ketterle, and C. Salomon (to be published).
¹⁹ I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys. (to be published).
²⁰ E. Taylor, A. Griffin, N. Fukushima, and Y. Ohashi, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 063626 (2006).
²¹ M. E. Fisher, M. N. Barber, and D. Jasnow, Phys. Rev. A **8**, 1111 (1983).
²² V. N. Popov, *Functional Integrals and Collective Excitations* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
²³ The time-ordering of this Green's function is implicit in the functional integral approach. For further discussion, see H. T. C. Stoof, e-print: cond-mat/9910441v1, and p. 170 in A. Altland and B. Simons, *Condensed Matter Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
²⁴ N. Andrenacci, P. Pieri, and G. C. Strinati, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 144507 (2003).
²⁵ Note that while the inverse pair propagator does not in general admit a small- \mathbf{q}, ν_m expansion at finite T [see for instance, H. T. C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 7979 (1998)], a small- \mathbf{q} expansion is valid for the *static* propagator, the quantity we are ultimately interested (see Sec. IV). The frequency is included in this expansion only to make the structure of $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{q}, \nu_m)$ clear.
²⁶ N. Fukushima, Y. Ohashi, E. Taylor, and A. Griffin, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 033609 (2007).
²⁷ J. R. Engelbrecht, M. Randeria, and C. A. R. Sá de Melo, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 15153 (1997).
²⁸ The Cooper pair propagator can be transformed via unitary transformation into a 2×2 matrix propagator describing fluctuations of the phase and amplitude of the order parameter. In the long wavelength limit, $(\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11} - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12}$ is the inverse propagator for phase fluctuations.²⁷

- ²⁹ E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics, Part 2* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2002).
- ³⁰ L. Salasnich, N. Manini, and A. Parola, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 023621 (2005).
- ³¹ P. Pieri and G. C. Strinati, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 094520 (2005).
- ³² D. S. Petrov, C. Salomon, and G. V. Shlyapnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 090404 (2004).
- ³³ P. Nozières and S. Schmitt-Rink, Journ. Low Temp. Phys. **59**, 195 (1985).
- ³⁴ A. Perali, P. Pieri, L. Pisani, and G. C. Strinati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 220404 (2004).
- ³⁵ H. Hu, X.-J. Liu, and P. D. Drummond, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 023617 (2006).
- ³⁶ H. Hu, X.-J. Liu, and P. D. Drummond, e-print: arXiv:0712.0037.
- ³⁷ R. Haussmann, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 12975 (1994).
- ³⁸ Y. He, C.-C. Chien, Q. Chen, and K. Levin, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 224516 (2007).
- ³⁹ From the definition of the superfluid density in Eq. (4), ρ_s is associated with the change δF in the free energy due to a small “twist” of the order parameter *phase* ϕ . By $U(1)$ gauge symmetry, the free energy can only depend on the gradient of the phase. Performing a gradient expansion of the free energy, it follows that $\delta F[\Delta_\sigma e^{i\phi}] \simeq \delta F[\Delta_0, \langle \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle]$ is expressed in terms of the correlation function for the gradient $\nabla \phi$ of the phase. This is directly related to the \mathbf{q}^2 term in the expansion of the inverse phase fluctuation propagator $(\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{11} - (\mathbf{L}^{-1})_{12}$.
- ⁴⁰ See for instance, A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems*, (McGraw Hill, New York, 1971), Sec. 52.