

# Imbalanced Fermi Superfluid: Mesoscopic Enhancement of the Chandrasekhar-Clogston Limit

Masaki Tezuka<sup>1,\*</sup> and Masahito Ueda<sup>1,2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*ERATO Macroscopic Quantum Control Project, JST, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan*

(Dated: April 3, 2019)

By solving the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations with coupling-constant renormalization appropriate for a trapped system with a chemical potential difference, we show that the Chandrasekhar-Clogston (CC) limit increases with decreasing the atom number and increasing the trap aspect ratio. This finding reconciles the apparent discrepancy between the MIT and Rice experiments over the CC limit and breakdown of local density approximation.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Ss, 71.10.Ca, 37.10.Gh

Gaseous Fermi superfluids are endowed with new degrees of controllability over population difference and trap anisotropy. Imbalanced superfluidity of <sup>6</sup>Li has been observed by the Rice [1] and MIT [2] groups, but their results have shown marked differences over the validity of local density approximation (LDA) and the Chandrasekhar-Clogston (CC) limit – the upper bound of imbalance parameter  $P \equiv (N_{\uparrow} - N_{\downarrow}) / (N_{\uparrow} + N_{\downarrow})$  beyond which superfluidity breaks down [3], where  $N_{\uparrow}$  and  $N_{\downarrow}$  are the numbers of majority and minority atoms. In the MIT experiment the profiles of both majority and minority clouds obey LDA, while in the Rice experiment with a very elongated trap and fewer atoms, LDA apparently breaks down. The CC limit was observed at MIT but no CC limit was found at Rice. A phenomenological surface tension [4, 5] of the condensate was shown to reproduce the deformation observed by the Rice group, but how to reconcile the apparently contradicting experimental differences without free parameters remains elusive. This Letter resolves the problem by showing that Fermi superfluidity is enhanced by the effect of confinement and the trap anisotropy.

We consider a system of atoms with mass  $m$  confined in an axisymmetric harmonic potential with axial frequency  $\omega_z$  and radial one  $\omega_{\perp}$ , and analyze superfluidity of this system using the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) equations [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Sensarma et al. [10] studied the shape of the atom cloud by changing  $N$  and  $P (\leq 0.4)$ , and argued that  $(N/\lambda)^{1/3} \gg 1$  ( $\lambda \equiv \omega_{\perp}/\omega_z$ ) should be the condition for the validity of LDA. For  $(N/\lambda)^{1/3} \sim 10$ , the cloud shape obtained in [10] looks quite similar to that of the equipotential surface. However, the Rice group experiment shows the breakdown of LDA for almost the same value of  $(N/\lambda)^{1/3}$ . Figure 1 summarizes the results of our study and of the experiments, including the recent ones by the Rice group [6] at  $\lambda = 3$  and 12. Our results are consistent with Ref. [10] as to whether significant deformation occurs for  $N \sim 10^3$  at  $\lambda = 2$  and 4, but the density profiles are different presumably because we incorporate the effect of the chemical potential difference




FIG. 1: Range of validity of local density approximation (LDA), where  $N$  is the total atom number and  $\lambda \equiv \omega_{\perp}/\omega_z$  the trap aspect ratio. Circles (squares) show where the atomic cloud deviates little (significantly) from equipotential surfaces. Filled symbols show the results of the present work, while the large open symbols show the experimental results by Rice ( $\lambda = 3, 12$  [6], 50 [1]) and MIT ( $\lambda = 5$ ) [2].

in our renormalization scheme.

The BdG equations for unequal chemical potentials ( $\mu_{\uparrow}, \mu_{\downarrow}$ ) read

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{H}_{\uparrow} + gn_{\downarrow} & \Delta \\ \Delta^* & -\hat{H}_{\downarrow} - gn_{\uparrow} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_q \\ v_q \end{pmatrix} = \epsilon_q \begin{pmatrix} u_q \\ v_q \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{H}_{\sigma} \equiv -\nabla^2/(2m) + V(\mathbf{r}) - \mu_{\sigma}$  ( $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ ) is the one-body Hamiltonian, and the coupling constant  $g$  is given in terms of s-wave scattering length  $a$  as  $g = 4\pi\hbar^2 a/m$ . In the following we take  $m = \hbar = \omega_{\perp} = 1$ , and choose  $\sqrt{\hbar/(m\omega_{\perp})} = 1$  as the unit length. The self-consistent conditions give the density distributions and the s-wave




FIG. 2: (Color online) Top panel shows the  $P$  dependence of the ratio  $R$  of the axial to radial cloud widths at which the atomic density equals  $1/20$  of its peak value. Lower panels show the density difference between majority and minority atoms plotted for  $\lambda = 5$  (left) and  $50$  (right) with  $k_F g = -6$ ,  $N = 2.0 \times 10^3$ , and varying imbalance parameter  $P$ . The trap axis lies in the horizontal direction.

singlet pair amplitude as

$$\begin{aligned}
 n_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{r}) &= \sum_q f(\epsilon_q) |u_q(\mathbf{r})|^2, \\
 n_{\downarrow}(\mathbf{r}) &= \sum_q (1 - f(\epsilon_q)) |v_q(\mathbf{r})|^2, \\
 \Delta(\mathbf{r}) &= g_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r}) \sum_q f(\epsilon_q) u_q(\mathbf{r}) v_q^*(\mathbf{r}),
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where  $f(\epsilon) \equiv (e^{\beta\epsilon} + 1)^{-1}$  is the Fermi function with  $\beta \equiv (k_B T)^{-1}$ . To cope with the ultraviolet divergence in  $\Delta(\mathbf{r})$ , we follow Bulgac and Yu [13] and treat the contribution from states above the energy cutoff within LDA. In Ref. [13], where  $\mu = \mu_{\uparrow} = \mu_{\downarrow}$  is assumed, the single-particle Green's function  $G_{\mu}^0(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r})$  with  $\hat{H}_0 =$

$-\nabla^2/(2m) + V - \mu$  is used to remove the divergence. The regular part  $G_{\mu}^{0,\text{reg}}$  of  $G_{\mu}^0$  is obtained by employing the Thomas-Fermi approximation for the states above the cutoff energy  $E_c$ , so that the effective coupling constant is given in terms of  $k_F^0(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \sqrt{2(\mu - V(\mathbf{r}))}$  as

$$\frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{1}{g} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left( \frac{k_F^0(\mathbf{r})}{2} \ln \frac{k_C(\mathbf{r}) + k_F^0(\mathbf{r})}{k_C(\mathbf{r}) - k_F^0(\mathbf{r})} - k_C(\mathbf{r}) \right). \tag{3}$$

Grasso and Urban [14] replaced  $k_F^0(\mathbf{r})$  with  $\tilde{k}_F(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \sqrt{2(\mu - V(\mathbf{r}) - W(\mathbf{r}))}$ , where  $W(\mathbf{r})$  is the Hartree-Fock mean-field energy  $gn_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$ , which is independent of  $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$  for  $\mu_{\uparrow} = \mu_{\downarrow}$ , so that the convergence is achieved for much smaller values of  $E_c$ . We adopt this method except that we replace  $G_{\mu}^{0,\text{reg}}$  by  $(G_{\mu_{\uparrow}}^{0,\text{reg}} + G_{\mu_{\downarrow}}^{0,\text{reg}})/2$  to maintain a given chemical potential difference. Consequently, Eq. (3) is replaced by

$$\frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{1}{g} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left( \sum_{\sigma} \frac{\tilde{k}_{F\sigma}}{4} \ln \frac{k_C + \tilde{k}_{F\sigma}}{k_C - \tilde{k}_{F\sigma}} - k_C \right), \tag{4}$$

where  $\tilde{k}_{F\uparrow,\downarrow}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \sqrt{2(\mu_{\uparrow,\downarrow} - V(\mathbf{r}) - gn_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(\mathbf{r}))}$ . While BdG theory was originally intended to describe the weak-coupling BCS limit, it was demonstrated to describe the BEC limit [15], and the BCS-BEC crossover region was also studied by this theory [16]. We therefore expect that this theory is applicable, at least qualitatively, for the strongly interacting region with population imbalance. We take  $k_B T = 0.05$  and  $k_F(\mathbf{0})g = -6$  with  $k_F \equiv (k_{F\uparrow} + k_{F\downarrow})/2$ , use the Steffensen iteration to solve Eqs. (1) and (2), and self-consistently determine  $g$ ,  $n_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{r})$ ,  $n_{\downarrow}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\Delta(\mathbf{r})$  for each set of  $(\mu_{\uparrow}, \mu_{\downarrow})$ . The number of atoms in the  $\sigma (= \uparrow, \downarrow)$  state is defined as  $N_{\sigma} \equiv \int d^3r n_{\sigma}$ .

Figure 2 shows the main results of this Letter. For  $\lambda = 5$ , the ratio of the axial to radial cloud widths remains close to  $\lambda$  for both minority and majority atoms, and the dip of the density difference rapidly dwindles with increasing  $P$ . For  $\lambda = 50$ , the minority cloud shrinks dramatically in the axial direction, and the density difference shows a dip at the center even for  $P = 0.95$ . To investigate resilience of superfluidity against imbalance, we calculate integrated pair amplitude  $\bar{\Delta} \equiv |\int d^3r \Delta(\mathbf{r})|$  for  $\lambda = 50$ , and find that, as the cutoff energy  $E_c$  is raised,  $\bar{\Delta}/N_{\downarrow}$  approaches a nonzero value for  $P$  up to 0.95 (this number is limited by the limited number of atoms  $N \leq 3 \times 10^3$ ). We thus conclude that superfluid survives for this extreme population imbalance.

Figure 3 shows typical distributions of  $n_{\uparrow,\downarrow}$ , their difference and  $\Delta$  for  $P = 0.70$ . We rescale the calculated distribution as  $r \rightarrow \lambda r$  so that the equipotential surface becomes a circle. For  $\lambda = 5$ , the shape of the minority component and the density difference closely follow the equipotential surface, as shown in the left column of Fig. 2. For larger population imbalance, the pair amplitude decreases significantly. While a small, oscillating




FIG. 3: (Color online) Majority and minority density distributions  $n_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(z,r)$ , their difference  $n_{\uparrow}(z,r) - n_{\downarrow}(z,r)$  and pair amplitude  $\Delta(z,r)$  plotted for  $\lambda = 5$  (left) and  $\lambda = 50$  (right) with  $k_{FG} = -6$  and  $N = 2.00 \times 10^3$  at  $P = 0.70$ . The distributions and  $\Delta$  are displayed in color-coded gauges shown on the upper right and lower right, respectively. In each inset, the values for  $r = 0$  and  $z = 0$  are plotted against  $z$  and  $\lambda r$ , respectively.




FIG. 4: (Color online) CC limit  $P_c$  is plotted against the total number of trapped atoms  $N$ . Here,  $P_c$  is obtained as the value of  $P$  where the extrapolated plot of  $\Delta$  crosses zero.

pair amplitude is seen near the trap center, the density difference peaks at  $r = 0$ . We therefore conclude that LDA is essentially obeyed at  $\lambda = 5$  as observed by the MIT group. For  $\lambda = 50$ , while the density of the majority component looks almost like a circle, the minority component is shorter in the axial ( $z$ ) rather than radial ( $r$ ) direction, implying the breakdown of LDA. The density difference nearly vanishes where the minority population is large, and two side peaks emerge at the axial edges of the minority component. These features are similar to those observed by the Rice group. We also note that as  $|z|$  increases, the pair amplitude drops at  $|z| \sim 40$  within  $|r| \sim 2$ , and then  $\Delta$  shows small-amplitude damped oscillations.

With the same number of atoms, we have thus found that LDA is obeyed at  $\lambda = 5$  and not at  $\lambda = 50$ . The breakdown of LDA is a finite-size effect, and it is en-

hanced for larger  $\lambda$ . Figure 4 shows the atom-number dependence of the CC limit  $P_c$  for a spherical trap. We find that with decreasing  $N$ ,  $P_c$  increases toward unity.

Why is the finite-size effect enhanced for larger  $\lambda$ ? If the condensate shrinks axially, the area of the surface between the condensate and the normal gas decreases. The decrease in the surface energy is more significant for larger  $\lambda$ , and outweighs an increase in the potential energy due to the deformation of the clouds.

Looking at the density-difference distribution for  $\lambda = 50$  plotted in Fig. 3, we find that the difference shows a sudden increase in the  $z$  direction between  $|z| \sim 25$  and  $|z| \sim 40$ , up to  $|r| \sim 1$ . Here, the pair amplitude shows a sharp decay followed by damped oscillations. One possibility to understand the oscillation of the pair amplitude is to assume the Larkin-Ovchinnikov (LO) type pairing [7, 12, 17] between majority and minority components with Fermi momentum difference  $\pm \mathbf{q} \parallel \hat{z}$ . The LO state favors a constant density difference perpendicular to  $\hat{z}$  and thus a flat surface of the condensate, which manifests itself in the right column of Fig. 2.

Such a flat surface is also favored in a pancake-type ( $\lambda \equiv \omega_z/\omega_{\perp} > 1$ ) trap, as shown in Fig. 5 for  $\lambda = 5$  and  $P = 0.95$ . Compared with the majority component, the minority component shrinks predominantly in the radial direction. The pair amplitude shows oscillation in the same direction. The LO-like oscillations thus appear in the narrower rather than wider side of the atomic cloud.

To summarize, we have studied superfluidity of population-imbalanced fermions trapped in an axisym-




FIG. 5: (Color online) Same as in Fig. 3 for  $\lambda = 0.2$ ,  $k_F g = -6$  and  $N = 2.05 \times 10^3$  at  $P = 0.95$ .

metric harmonic trap by means of the Bogoliubov-de Gennes method. Our numerical results reproduce the major differences of the experiments conducted at MIT and Rice as to whether LDA breaks down and whether the condensate disappears at a finite value of population imbalance. The anomalous behavior observed by the Rice group can be understood as superfluidity being enhanced due to confinement and trap anisotropy. In the case of a very elongated trap, energy cost due to surface tension is caused mainly at two edges in the axial direction. Since this energy cost in surface tension is mitigated by an increase in the trap aspect ratio, the CC limit is enhanced accordingly. We have thus identified an interesting interplay between the mesoscopic effect and the trap anisotropy in enhancing the superfluidity of the system. In particular, we can envisage a situation in which for a given temperature and imbalanced populations the system makes a transition from a normal to superfluid phase as the trap aspect ratio is increased. Such an effect is unseen in superconductivity and merits further experimental and theoretical study.

We gratefully acknowledge fruitful discussions with R. Hulet and W. Ketterle. M.T. would like to thank T. Mizushima for valuable comments.

Part of the computation in this work has been done using the facilities of the Supercomputer Center, Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo. M.T. is supported by Research Fellowship of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for Young Scientists.

\* Electronic address: tezuka@cat.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

† Electronic address: ueda@phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

- [1] G. B. Partridge, W. Li, Y. A. Liao, R. G. Hulet, M. Haque, and H. T. C. Stoof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 190407 (2006) and references.
- [2] Y.-I. Shin, C. H. Schunck, A. Schirotzek, and W. Ketterle, *Nature (London)* **451**, 689 (2008) and references.
- [3] B. S. Chandrasekhar, *App. Phys. Lett.* **1**, 7 (1962); A. M. Clogston, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **9**, 266 (1962).
- [4] T. N. De Silva and E. J. Mueller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 070402 (2006).
- [5] M. Haque and H. T. C. Stoof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 260406 (2007).
- [6] Y. A. Liao, W. Li, G. B. Partridge, T. Paprotta, and R. G. Hulet, unpublished.
- [7] P. Castorina, M. Grasso, M. Oertel, M. Urban, and D. Zappalà, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 025601 (2005).
- [8] X.-J. Liu, H. Hu, and P. D. Drummond, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 023614 (2007).
- [9] T. Mizushima, K. Machida, and M. Ichioka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 060404 (2005).
- [10] R. Sensarma, W. Schneider, R. B. Diener, and M. Randeria, arXiv:0706.1741v1 (2007).
- [11] K. Machida, T. Mizushima, and M. Ichioka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 120407 (2006); T. Mizushima, M. Ichioka, and K. Machida, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **76**, 104006 (2007).
- [12] J. Kinnunen, L. M. Jensen, and P. Törmä, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110403 (2006).
- [13] A. Bulgac and Y. Yu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 042504 (2002).
- [14] M. Grasso and M. Urban, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 033610 (2003).
- [15] P. Pieri and G. C. Strinati, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 030401 (2003).
- [16] H. Heiselberg, *New J. Phys.* **6**, 137 (2004).
- [17] A. Larkin and Y. Ovchinnikov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz* **47**, 1136 (1964).