

Bosonic thermoelectric transport and breakdown of universality

A. Rançon¹, Cheng Chin^{1,2}, and K. Levin¹

¹*James Franck Institute and Department of Physics,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA*

²*Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA*
(Dated: March 8, 2019)

In this paper we compare Bose transport in normal phase atomic gases with its counterpart in Fermi gases, illustrating the non-universality of two dimensional bosonic transport associated with different dissipation mechanisms. Near the superfluid transition temperature T_c , a striking similarity between the fermionic and bosonic transport emerges because super-conducting(fluid) fluctuation transport for Fermi gases is dominated by the bosonic, Cooper pair component. As in fluctuation theory, one finds that the Seebeck coefficient changes sign at T_c and the Lorenz number approaches zero at T_c . Our findings appear semi-quantitatively consistent with recent Bose gas experiments.

PACS numbers: 05.60.Gg, 67.10.Jn, 67.85.De

Introduction - In this letter, we discuss the transport coefficients of atomic gases in the normal phase. While our emphasis is on Bose gases, even in fermionic systems bosonic degrees of freedom and related bosonic transport are frequently present. Moreover, because of differences in the statistical factors, their transport is generally dominant. In particular, near superfluid condensation, bosons appear in Fermi gases as fluctuating Cooper pairs leading to, for example, large mass flow conductivity [1]. In this paper we show how this fermionic “fluctuation” theory appears reasonably consistent with recent Bose gas experiments on the Seebeck coefficient and Lorenz ratio [2]. We also examine the behavior away from condensation and show that here fermionic systems exhibit many universal transport features, while Bose transport is highly non-universal, depending strongly on the mechanisms of dissipation. As a corollary, we predict that future measurements of transport in atomic Fermi superfluids may provide an important way to establish when bosonic degrees of freedom (*e.g.*, the “pseudogap” regime, or preformed pairs [3]) are present.

Cold atom samples differ from electronic systems in significant ways that offer new opportunities to investigate transport phenomena [2, 4–6]. Cold atom systems are highly versatile: they have tunable interactions, can be confined in different dimensions as well as in a single potential well or in lattices. Furthermore, at nano-Kelvin temperatures, the dynamics of atoms is very slow, in contrast to *ps* for their electronic counterparts. The slow dynamics permits detailed scrutiny of atomic motion. One powerful tool is *in situ* imaging of atoms, which reveals high space-time resolution images of atomic distributions in snapshots [7–9]. In a condensed matter analogy, this technique is equivalent to following the electron dynamics with *fs* resolution.

Applying transport theory developed for electrons to atoms, however, requires careful consideration; universal transport laws developed for electrons need to be revis-

ited when applied to bosons. We note, first of all, that cold atom samples are isolated in vacuum, and lack thermal reservoirs. Atom number and energy are frequently conserved quantities. This suggests that a statistical description based on a grand-canonical ensemble may only apply locally to a small subset of the sample [10] and both temperature and temperature inhomogeneity can develop in a dynamic process. Secondly, atoms are neutral and the analogue of electrical conduction will be the particle flow or mass flow driven, not by electric field, but by a chemical potential gradient, $\nabla\mu$. Interestingly, cold gas superfluids, unlike their neutral liquid Helium counterparts, allow the imposition of a non-zero $\nabla\mu$ and thus are rather uniquely amenable to these transport studies.

Thirdly, to employ transport theory, the samples should be in the hydrodynamic regime with coherence length much shorter than the sample and relaxation time less than the measurement time resolution. When these criteria are satisfied the atoms can reach a local equilibrium associated with coarse graining the system over a proper length and time scale. One can then assign an inhomogeneous field description for thermodynamic quantities, *e.g.*, temperature field $T(x; t)$ and chemical potential field $\mu(x; t)$, to describe the thermodynamic forces. This approximation, which we will call the local equilibrium approximation (LEA), limits the resolution of both temporal and spatial measurements, and should be distinguished from the local density approximation that describes inhomogeneously trapped atoms in equilibrium. LEA is assumed valid throughout this study.

Finally, cold atom systems are usually confined in conservative optical traps or optical lattices. They are generally free from impurities, and background ionic lattices, including their phononic excitations. The fact that atoms are in a clean environment, on the one hand, may simplify many-body calculations; this removes some complexity encountered in electron transport in materials. On the other hand, it also raises concerns about the relax-

ation mechanism in cold atom dynamics, and a straightforward applicability of transport theory.

We define the transport coefficients (which are c-numbers here) in terms of the linear response of the particle current \mathbf{J}_p and the heat current \mathbf{J}_Q to ∇T and $\nabla\mu$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_p \\ \mathbf{J}_Q \end{pmatrix} = -\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathcal{S} \\ \mathcal{P} & T\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{S}\mathcal{P} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nabla\mu \\ \nabla T \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where σ is the conductivity, \mathcal{S} is the Seebeck coefficient, \mathcal{P} is the Peltier coefficient and \mathcal{L} is the Lorenz number. For notational purposes it is sometimes convenient to define the transport matrix elements such that $\mathbf{J}_p = -L_{11}\nabla\mu - L_{12}\nabla T$ and $\mathbf{J}_Q = -L_{21}\nabla\mu - L_{22}\nabla T$. Then the conductivity $\sigma \equiv L_{11}$, the Seebeck coefficient (or thermopower) $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{P}/T \equiv L_{12}/L_{11}$ and the Lorenz number $\mathcal{L} \equiv (L_{22}L_{11} - L_{12}L_{21})/(TL_{11}^2)$. Note that L_{12} and L_{21} satisfy the Onsager relation $L_{12} = L_{21}/T$. We work with units such that $\hbar = k_B = 1$.

The key to understanding transport is the introduction of dissipative mechanisms, without which transport coefficients are generally ill-behaved and a steady state cannot be reached. Processes associated with inter-particle interactions are essential for the LEA, but not sufficient to give rise to dissipation of the momentum in Galilean invariant systems, although the presence of a trap, in principle breaks this invariance. Thus the conductivity, which is perhaps the simplest transport coefficient, will be infinite unless Galilean invariance is broken or there are collisions with ‘‘external’’ particles. These are unlikely to be impurities, but can reflect trapping potential corrugation, systematic [11] and intrinsic [12] fluctuations of optical potentials. General effects of a disordered potential leading to localization [13] are seen in related transport experiments [4, 5]. Important also are additional particles not participating in the transport. In this context, dissipation, particularly of the condensate, but also of the non-condensed components is treated in the literature in a stochastic manner [14, 15]. It has been associated with scattering from higher energy bosons, which may (because of effective mass effects) be less active in transport. One can establish the presence of dissipation experimentally, for example, in re-equilibration after interaction quenches [16].

Phenomenological Approach to Bosonic and Fermionic Transport - In order to describe a bosonic system at positive chemical potential, one has to include the (non-dissipative) effect of the inter-boson interactions, so that the chemical potential $\mu \rightarrow \mu - \mu_c$, see for instance [17] for an estimate in weak coupling. The (finite-temperature) phase transition between the normal and superfluid phases happens when $\mu = \mu_c(T)$ at a given temperature T .

For a Hamiltonian with only one-body terms, there is an exact expression [18] based on the Kubo formula for the transport coefficients, first derived for fermions but

readily generalized to bosons,

$$L_{ij} = T^{1-j} \int_0^\infty d\epsilon (\epsilon - \mu)^{i+j-2} \frac{2\epsilon}{md} \rho(\epsilon) \tau(\epsilon) b_\pm^{(1)}, \quad (2)$$

where, $b_\pm^{(1)} \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega} b_\pm(\omega)$, with $b_\pm(\omega) = (z_\pm^{-1} e^{\frac{\omega}{T}} \pm 1)^{-1}$ the Fermi/Bose distribution. The fugacity z_\pm is defined as $z_+ = e^{\mu/T}$ for fermions, and $z_- = e^{(\mu - \mu_c)/T}$ ($\mu < \mu_c$) for bosons. We introduce $\rho(\epsilon) = (\frac{m}{2\pi})^{d/2} \frac{\epsilon^{d/2-1}}{\Gamma(d/2)}$ the d -dimensional density of states for free particles of mass m . Here the important parameter $\tau(\epsilon)$ is a generally unknown function involving the details of the dissipation, which we treat throughout phenomenologically as $\tau(\epsilon) = \tau_0 \epsilon^{\eta/2}$. This parameter plays the role of the relaxation time in Boltzmann theories of transport [29].

The transport coefficients derived from Eq. (2) are

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \frac{\Gamma(\zeta + 1)\tau_0}{\Gamma(d/2 + 1)m\lambda_{\text{dB}}^d} |\text{Li}_\zeta(\mp z_\pm)|, \\ \mathcal{S} &= (\zeta + 1) \frac{\text{Li}_{\zeta+1}(\mp z_\pm)}{\text{Li}_\zeta(\mp z_\pm)} - \ln z_\pm, \\ \mathcal{L} &= (\zeta + 1)(\zeta + 2) \frac{\text{Li}_{\zeta+2}(\mp z_\pm)}{\text{Li}_\zeta(\mp z_\pm)} - [\mathcal{S} + \ln z_\pm]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\zeta = (d + \eta)/2$, $\tau_0 = \tau(T)$, $\lambda_{\text{dB}} = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{mT}}$, and

$$\text{Li}_\alpha(\mp x) = \frac{\mp 1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty dt \frac{t^{\alpha-1}}{x^{-1}e^t \pm 1} \quad (4)$$

are the polylogarithm functions.

For degenerate fermions ($\ln z_+ \gg 1$), the factor $b_+^{(1)}$ is peaked around $\mu > 0$, which defines the Fermi energy. Thus the energy dependence of τ is not relevant and the transport coefficient \mathcal{L} for a degenerate Fermi gas ($z_+ \gg 1$), known as the Wiedermann-Franz law, $\mathcal{L}_f = \pi^2/3$ is universal (independent of d and η). By contrast, for bosons Eq. (2) is valid only in the normal phase ($\mu - \mu_c < 0$) and all ϵ contribute to the integrals, so that \mathcal{L} will necessarily depend on the details of the dissipation. Here, $b_-^{(1)}$ diverges when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ at $\mu = \mu_c$, so that the energy dependence of τ plays an important role in the fluctuation regime close to condensation. One finds that \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{L} behave as power laws of $\delta\tilde{\mu} = (\mu - \mu_c)/T$ with an exponent that depends on both d and η .

Transport near condensation in fluctuation approaches - For quasi-free bosons, following Refs. 1, 19, 20 we again ignore specific two-body effects and use a different application of the Kubo formula to rewrite transport coefficients in terms of Green’s functions. Because there are no vertex corrections, one can express the various transport coefficients in terms of two factors of the bosonic spectral function, $A(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ [21]:

$$L_{ij} = \frac{T^{1-j}}{2m^2} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \omega^{i+j-2} \frac{k^2}{d} [A(\mathbf{k}, \omega)]^2 b_-^{(1)}(\omega). \quad (5)$$

We introduce the bosonic propagator $G(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \equiv \left[\omega - \Sigma_1(\mathbf{k}, \omega) - \frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{2m} + \mu - \mu_c + \frac{i}{2}\Sigma_2(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \right]^{-1}$, with imaginary component given by the spectral function appearing in Eq. (5)

$$A(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{\Sigma_2(\mathbf{k}, \omega)}{\left(\omega - \frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{2m} + \mu - \mu_c - \Sigma_1(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (\Sigma_2(\mathbf{k}, \omega))^2}, \quad (6)$$

where the critical chemical potential μ_c is a phenomenological parameter, and we take $\Sigma_1(0, 0) = 0$.

Understanding the dissipation is related to understanding Σ_2 , the imaginary component of the single particle self-energy $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 - \frac{i}{2}\Sigma_2$. A crucial feature of bosons is that Σ_2 changes sign at $\omega = 0$, so that the spectral function A has the sign of ω . Compatible with this constraint is the requirement that in the low ω limit

$$\Sigma_2 \propto \omega^n \quad \text{for } n = 1, 3, 5 \dots \quad (7)$$

Near condensation, the low ω contribution will dominate. The simplest such model, used in the literature and in our previous work [16], is associated with $n = 1$ ($\Sigma_2(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \Gamma\omega$), which corresponds to an Ohmic dissipation, equivalent to $\eta = -2$ above [30].

In this near-condensation regime, we find a similarity between fermions and bosons, as both cases are described by bosonic transport theory as in Eq. (5). One sees that, in this quasi-free boson limit [21], the Ohmic case ($\Sigma_2 \propto \omega$) corresponds to a time-dependent Ginsburg-Landau theory, as associated with fermionic superfluids. This is closely related to a dissipative Gross-Pitaevskii equation for the normal bosons. The fluctuation propagator is found [1, 19] to be proportional to

$$D^{fluc}(\mathbf{q}, i\omega) \propto \frac{1}{[(-1 + i\lambda)(i\omega) + \mathcal{D}q^2 + (8/\pi)(T - T_c)]} \quad (8)$$

Here one describes the approach to the transition by $T - T_c$, whereas $\mu - \mu_c$ is preferred in the cold atom community. The spectral function of Eq. (8) can be seen to be effectively equivalent to Eq. (6), when the dissipation is Ohmic. We define \mathcal{D} as the so-called diffusion coefficient and $\lambda = [2\pi T/gN(0)][N'(0)/N(0)]$ depends on the density of states at the Fermi energy $N(0)$ and its derivative.

To establish quantitative predictions, it is convenient (for $d = 2$) to define scale-invariant transport coefficients:

$$L_{ij}(\mu, T) = T^{i-1} \tilde{L}_{ij}(\mu/T). \quad (9)$$

Indeed, we will show below that the coefficients are dependent on μ/T and not on each of these variables separately. From their definition, it follows that \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{L} are also scale invariant.

As $\delta\tilde{\mu} \equiv (\mu - \mu_c)/T$ goes to zero (but away from the critical regime) we can deduce the transport coefficients




Figure 1: Lorenz number \mathcal{L} computed from Eq. (3) in $d = 2$ with $\eta = -2$ for bosons (solid red lower line) and fermions (short-dashed green) and with $\eta = 0$ for bosons (solid blue upper line) and fermions (dashed magenta line), as function of $\ln(z_{\pm})$. The dotted black line is the Wiedemann-Franz asymptote $\mathcal{L} = \frac{\pi^2}{3}$ which is reached in the degenerate limit $\ln(z_{\pm}) \gg 1$. The inset shows the behavior of the transport coefficients \tilde{L}_{ij} close to condensation, as predicted by the fluctuation theory for an Ohmic model [Eq. (5) with $n = 1$].

for the two-dimensional case from the integrals in Eqs. (5) and their counterparts. The behavior can be summarized in terms of well known [1, 19, 20] proportionality relations (for $n = 1$ or equivalently $\eta = -2$)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_{11} &\propto \frac{1}{|\delta\tilde{\mu}|}, \\ \tilde{L}_{12} &\propto -\ln|\delta\tilde{\mu}|, \\ \tilde{L}_{22} &\propto \text{const.} + |\delta\tilde{\mu}| \ln|\delta\tilde{\mu}|. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Thus, from Eqs. (10) we deduce that the Seebeck coefficient (thermopower) and Lorenz number behave as [31]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &\propto -|\delta\tilde{\mu}| \ln|\delta\tilde{\mu}|, \\ \mathcal{L} &\propto |\delta\tilde{\mu}|. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The thermopower changes sign at condensation and the Lorenz number tends to zero linearly. Recall that \mathcal{L} must be greater or equal to zero for thermodynamic stability. In the case $\eta = 0$, as used in Ref. 22 based on a Boltzmann boson approach designed for high- T_c superconductors, one finds $\tilde{\sigma} \propto \ln|\delta\tilde{\mu}|$ which is to be contrasted with the Ohmic case where the divergences at condensation are more evident. As a consequence $\mathcal{L} \propto 1/\ln|\delta\tilde{\mu}|$ and the thermopower \mathcal{S} will similarly vanish logarithmically.

Scale invariance of two-dimensional bosonic transport - Scale invariance is a hallmark of the thermodynamics of two-dimensional Bose gases [23, 24]. Although, experimentally it has not been tested [2], here we argue that scale invariance should also persist in transport. In a two-dimensional Bose gas, by varying the chemical potential from negative to positive values at zero temperature, one induces a quantum phase transition between a

state with vanishing pressure and no particles (vacuum) and a superfluid state with a nonzero pressure. This $\mu = T = 0$ quantum critical point (QCP) [25] or zero-temperature phase transition must not be confused with the finite-temperature phase transition between the normal and superfluid phase discussed in the rest of this paper. The presence of this QCP implies that a thermodynamic quantity such as the pressure is a universal function of μ/T and \tilde{g} , the two dimensional dimensionless interaction. This implies, in turn, scale invariance so that all thermodynamic functions in the dilute two-dimensional Bose gas depend only on μ/T (once the interaction strength has been fixed) [26]. For the normal-superfluid phase transition at finite T , one finds that the critical chemical potential (at a given temperature) is given by $\mu_c(T) = T \mathfrak{M}(\tilde{g})$, where $\mathfrak{M}(x)$ is also universal.

From these results at equilibrium, we can infer that due to this same QCP, the transport coefficients take a scaling form [32]. Building on the universality of $\mu_c(T)/T$, we have

$$L_{ij}(\mu, T) = T^{i-1} \mathfrak{L}_{ij}\left(\frac{\mu - \mu_c}{T}, \tilde{g}, \eta\right). \quad (12)$$

Note that we have explicitly shown the dependence of the transport scaling functions on the dissipation processes through η . Eq. (9) is compatible with Eq. (12) and is valid in the whole experimentally interesting range of the temperature and the chemical potential. In particular, this scaling holds far from the normal-superfluid critical regime [33]. This, in turn, implies that even though for a *given kind* of dissipation (defined by η , or n) the transport coefficients of a dilute Bose gas are universal (*i.e.* described by a function \mathfrak{L}_{ij}) in the whole μ - T plane, it will be different for different kinds of dissipation mechanisms (*i.e.* different power laws), thus defining different universality classes.

Results: comparison with experiment near condensation - In the main body of Figure 1, we plot the transport coefficient ratio \mathcal{L} , for $d = 2$ as a function of scaled chemical potential with different values of the dissipation exponents $\eta = -2$ (associated with fluctuation models) and $\eta = 0$ [22], as computed using Eq. (2). Interestingly, in the particular Ohmic case, one obtains the same limiting behavior of the transport coefficients using either Eq. (2) [with $\eta = -2$] or Eq. (5). This figure indicates how different dissipative exponents η are reflected in transport.

The inset of Figure 1 illustrates the general divergences of the L_{ij} near T_c , associated with bosonic transport, as computed from Eq. (5) in the Ohmic case. Plotted are the the collected coefficients for $d = 2$ as a function of scaled chemical potential, for a typical $\Gamma = 0.1$ [16]. We have checked that the value of Γ does not change qualitatively the transport coefficients or power laws for $|\delta\tilde{\mu}| \lesssim 1$. Important here is that because of the divergence of $\sigma = L_{11}$, as μ goes to μ_c , \mathcal{L} (and

\mathcal{S}) vanish at T_c , for quasi-free bosons. By contrast for nearly-free fermions \mathcal{L} is structureless, asymptoting to the Wiedermann-Franz limit.

A more detailed comparison of theory and the experiments of Ref. 2 must focus on the near-condensation regime where in Figs. 2 we plot the thermopower and the Lorenz number as associated with a 2d Bose gas, obtained from Eq. (5). We find that the theory and ex-




Figure 2: Comparison with the experimental data of Ref.2 for the thermopower and Lorenz number as functions of $(\mu - \mu_c)/T$ for $\Gamma = 0.1$ for the Ohmic model ($n = 1$) in $d = 2$.

periment coincide nicely for the thermopower \mathcal{S} , but that the Lorenz number is off by about a factor of 2. Given the simplicity of the model, a disparity of order unity is not unreasonable.

Conclusions - This paper establishes a connection between transport properties in condensed matter and in normal-phase cold atom systems. In particular, it is hoped that, because they are intrinsically cleaner and better controlled systems (without the complexities of phononic contributions), ultracold Bose gases will help to address some of the unsettled issues pertaining to superconducting fluctuation transport [3]. In pursuing this fluctuation transport analogy here, the quantitative agreement between the measured thermopower in Ref. 2 and the predictions of the superconducting fluctuation theory is notable.

Our work has emphasized the strong sensitivity of Bose gases to the dissipation mechanism, and which contrasts significantly with the behavior of degenerate Fermi gases. In particular, we have argued that different dissipation mechanisms imply different scaling laws in Bose gases, which might define different universality classes. The universality found in thermodynamics of dilute Bose gases applicable to both homogeneous and lattices systems [23, 24, 26, 27], will also need to be addressed in future for the transport coefficients.

This work is supported by NSF-MRSEC Grant 0820054; CC acknowledges support from NSF PHY-

1206095 and ARO-MURI 63834-PH-MUR. We thank Chih-Chun Chien and Yan He for helpful conversations. CC thanks Grenier Charles and Antoine Georges for useful discussion.

-
- [1] A. Larkin and A. Varlamov, *Theory of Fluctuations in Superconductors* (Oxford University Press, 2005).
- [2] E. H. Hazlett, L.-C. Ha, and C. Chin, eprint, arXiv:1306.4018.
- [3] Q. J. Chen, J. Stajic, S. N. Tan, and K. Levin, Phys. Rep. **412**, 1 (2005).
- [4] D. Stadler, S. Krinner, J. Meineke, J.-P. Brantut, and T. Esslinger, Nature **491**, 736 (2012).
- [5] J.-P. Brantut, J. Meineke, D. Stadler, S. Krinner, and T. Esslinger, Science **337**, 1069 (2012).
- [6] J.-P. Brantut, C. Grenier, J. Meineke, D. Stadler, S. Krinner, C. Kollath, T. Esslinger, and A. Georges, ArXiv e-prints (2013), 1306.5754.
- [7] N. Gemelke, X. Zhang, C.-L. Hung, and C. Chin, Nature **460**, 995 (2009).
- [8] W. S. Bakr, J. I. Gillen, A. Peng, S. Folling, and M. Greiner, Nature **462**, 74 (2009).
- [9] J. F. Sherson, C. Weitenberg, M. Endres, M. Cheneau, I. Bloch, and S. Kuhr, Nature **467**, 68 (2010).
- [10] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshits, *Statistical Physics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1980).
- [11] T. A. Savard, K. M. O'Hara, and J. E. Thomas, Phys. Rev. A **56**, R1095 (1997).
- [12] J. Dalibard and C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **2**, 1707 (1985).
- [13] R. C. Kuhn, O. Sigwarth, C. Miniatura, D. Delande, and C. A. Müller, New Journal of Physics **9**, 161 (2007).
- [14] P. Blakie, A. Bradley, M. Davis, R. Ballagh, and C. Gardiner, Advances in Physics **57**, 363 (2008).
- [15] H. T. C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 768 (1997).
- [16] A. Rançon, C.-L. Hung, C. Chin, and K. Levin, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 031601(R) (2013).
- [17] B. Capogrosso-Sansone, S. Giorgini, S. Pilati, L. Pollet, N. Prokof'ev, B. Svistunov, and M. Troyer, New Journal of Physics **12**, 043010 (2010).
- [18] G. V. Chester and A. Thellung, Proceedings of the Physical Society **77**, 1005 (1961).
- [19] K. Maki, J. Low Temp. Physics **14**, 419 (1974).
- [20] W. J. Skocpol and M. Tinkham, Rep. Prog. Phys. **38**, 1049 (1975).
- [21] S. Tan and K. Levin, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 064510 (2004).
- [22] A. S. Alexandrov and N. F. Mott, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1075 (1993).
- [23] T. Yefsah, R. Desbuquois, L. Chomaz, K. J. Günter, and J. Dalibard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 130401 (2011).
- [24] C.-L. Hung, X. Zhang, N. Gemelke, and C. Chin, Nature **470**, 236 (2011).
- [25] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2011), 2nd ed.
- [26] A. Rançon and N. Dupuis, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 063607 (2012).
- [27] X. Zhang, C.-L. Hung, S.-K. Tung, and C. Chin, Science **335**, 1070 (2012).
- [28] M. P. A. Fisher, G. Grinstein, and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 587 (1990).
- [29] In Ref. 18, the transport coefficients are proved to be of the form $L_{ij} = T^{1-j} \int_0^\infty d\epsilon (\epsilon - \mu)^{i+j-2} G(\epsilon) b_+^{(1)}$, where $G(\epsilon)$ is an unknown function dependent of the details of the Hamiltonian. We can always rewrite $G(\epsilon) = \frac{2\epsilon}{m d} \rho(\epsilon) \tau(\epsilon)$, where $\tau(\epsilon)$ is now unknown.
- [30] Note that in principle the self-energy should be regularized at high frequency (above a cut-off frequency Ω). Because all the integrals computed here are convergent, we may view them as independent of Ω . This is valid if the characteristic energies, such as the temperature or the chemical potential are such that $\mu, T \ll \Omega$.
- [31] Generically, one finds in $d = 2$ that $\mathcal{S} \propto \mathcal{L} \propto \text{const.}$ for $\eta > 0$, $\mathcal{S} \propto \mathcal{L} \propto \delta\tilde{\mu}^{-\eta/2}$ for $0 > \eta > -2$, $\mathcal{S} \propto \delta\tilde{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{L} \propto \delta\tilde{\mu}^{-\eta/2}$ for $-2 > \eta > -4$ and finally $\mathcal{S} \propto \delta\tilde{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{L} \propto \delta\tilde{\mu}^2$ for $\eta < -4$. There are possible logarithmic corrections for $\eta = 0, -2$, and -4 .
- [32] The scaling of all thermodynamic quantities is valid in the critical regime close to the QCP, which here corresponds to the whole T - μ plan in the range of μ and T relevant for the experiments. The derivation of the scaling form of the transport coefficient can be found in [28] for L_{11} in dimension d and is easily generalized to $L_{ij}(\mu, T) = T^{(d-2)/z+i-1} \mathfrak{L}_{ij}\left(\frac{\mu}{T}, \tilde{g}(T), \eta\right)$. Here \mathfrak{L}_{ij} is a universal function (but dependent of d), $z = 2$ is the dynamical exponent and $\tilde{g}(T)$ is the generalization of the renormalized interaction in d dimension (in weak-coupling and $d = 2$, $\tilde{g}(T) \rightarrow \tilde{g}$), see [26] for a detailed discussion of the universal thermodynamics of Bose gases and its relation to the QCP.
- [33] In the critical regime of the normal-superfluid transition, the transport coefficients become scaling functions of $\delta\tilde{\mu}$ which depend on the finite-temperature fixed point ($O(2)$ Wilson-Fisher in $d = 3$ and Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless in $d = 2$), while still respecting the scaling forms given in Eq. (12).