

Charged Condensate and Helium Dwarf Stars

Gregory Gabadadze^{a,b} and Rachel A. Rosen^a

^a*Center for Cosmology and Particle Physics, Department of Physics
New York University, New York, NY 10003, USA*

^b*Joseph Henry Laboratories, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*

Abstract

White dwarf stars composed of carbon, oxygen or heavier elements are expected to crystallize as they cool down below certain temperatures. Yet, simple arguments suggest that the helium white dwarf cores may not solidify, mostly because of zero-point oscillations of the helium ions that would dissolve the crystalline structure. We argue that the interior of the helium dwarfs may instead form a macroscopic quantum state in which the charged helium-4 nuclei are in a Bose-Einstein condensate, while the relativistic electrons form a neutralizing degenerate Fermi liquid. We discuss the electric charge screening, and the spectrum of this substance, showing that the bosonic long-wavelength fluctuations exhibit a mass gap. Hence, there is a suppression at low temperatures of the boson contribution to the specific heat – the latter being dominated by the specific heat of the electrons near the Fermi surface. This state of matter may have observational signatures.

1 Introduction

Consider a system of a large number of neutral atoms, each having Z electrons, and for simplicity we focus on $Z \leq 10$. Suppose we increase the number-density of the atoms – denoted by J_0/Z , where J_0 is the electron number-density – so that the average separation between the atomic nuclei

$$d \equiv \left(\frac{3Z}{4\pi J_0} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (1)$$

becomes much smaller than the Bohr radius, but is still much greater than the size of the charged nuclei. This would certainly be the case when, for instance, $J_0 \simeq (0.5 - 5 \text{ MeV})^3$, for which the electron Fermi momentum, $p_F = (3\pi^2 J_0)^{1/3}$, ranges from well-relativistic to ultra-relativistic.

Under these circumstances the electron Fermi energy E_F will exceed the atomic binding energy, and the neutral atoms will dissolve into the electrons and nuclei. What is the ground state of such a system, when it's held together by gravity?

The answer would depend on its temperature T . At certain high temperatures a plasma of negatively charged electrons and positively charged nuclei (ions) would be the equilibrium state. However, for lower temperatures the system would undergo significant charges.

Let us consider the cooling process by ignoring the quantum mechanical effects for the nuclei (ions), while treating the electrons as a degenerate Fermi liquid¹. Consider the nuclei that are bosons. The strength of interactions of a *classical* plasma of the charged nuclei (ions) is customarily characterized by the ratio of the average Coulomb energy of a pair of ions to the thermal energy (see, e.g., [1])

$$\Gamma \equiv \frac{E_{Coulomb}}{2E_{Thermal}/3} = \frac{(Ze)^2/(4\pi d)}{k_B T}, \quad (2)$$

here e denotes the electric charge, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and the second equality in (2) assumes the validity of the classical approximation.

It has been known that when $\Gamma \gtrsim 180$ the ion plasma is coupled strongly-enough for the system to crystallize, i.e., when the temperatures become low enough and Γ reaches the above-mentioned value, the system would undergo crystallization transition (for earlier works, see Refs. [2, 3], for latter studies, [4, 5, 6] and references therein). This has direct relevance to white dwarf stars (WDs): It is expected that in most of the white dwarfs, consisting of carbon, oxygen, or heavier elements, the crystallization transition takes place in the process of cooling (for a review, see, e.g., Ref. [7]).

The above discussions were classical. Although it was observed in Ref. [8] that the quantum effects of the *ions* may be important for cooling of the WDs, quantitative studies using a model for a quantum solid and Lindemann's empirical

¹The Coulomb energy of a pair of electrons here is smaller than the Fermi energy.

rule lead to a conclusion [6] that the melting curves for most of the WDs are not changed significantly by the quantum effects.

In the present work we're interested in the system of electrons and helium-4 nuclei. The latter being lighter than the other nuclei, and having lower charge, should be expected to reveal stronger sensitivity to the quantum effects.

Such a system should be present in cores of helium white dwarfs. These dwarf stars stayed relatively cool due to their binary companions, which kept accreting a part of the dwarf's energy during their paired evolution. As a result, the temperature in such dwarfs was never enough to begin the helium burning process.

The electron number-densities in the interval $J_0 \simeq (0.5 - 5 \text{ MeV})^3$ would correspond to the mass density of the helium-electron system $5 \cdot (10^7 - 10^{10}) \text{ g/cm}^3$. The densities closer to the lower end of this interval (which we refer to as the low densities hereafter) may well exist in cores of the helium white dwarfs. We will also discuss the densities closer to the upper end, as they may be present in some other astrophysical circumstances.

The system should be long lived as the helium-4 nuclei are stable w.r.t. fission. Furthermore, some nuclear reactions that could contaminate the helium-4 cores by their products are suppressed. One of this is the neutronization process due to the inverse beta-decay. In our case the electrons with $J_0 \simeq (0.5 - 5 \text{ MeV})^3$ are not energetic enough to reach the neutronization threshold of the helium-4 nucleus, which is about 20 MeV. Moreover, we would expect that the rate of helium fusion via the triple alpha-particle reaction is suppressed as the so-called pycnonuclear reaction (i.e., nuclear fusion due to zero-point oscillations in a high density environment) rates are exponentially small [1]. Hence, the cores of these WD's are expected to be dominated by helium-4 for very long time after their formation.

In what follows, we will focus on the case when $Z = 2$. Then, for $J_0 \simeq (0.5 - 5 \text{ MeV})^3$, the classical considerations of Eq. (2) would give the crystallization temperature of the helium ions $T_{\text{cryst}} \simeq (10^6 - 10^7) \text{ K}$. However, before these temperatures are reached from above, the de Broglie wavelengths of the helium nuclei would start to overlap, suggesting that the quantum effects of the ions may be important. An estimate for the critical temperature below which this will happen can be given by

$$T_c \simeq \frac{4\pi^2}{3m_H d^2}. \quad (3)$$

For the number densities at hand we obtain $T_c \simeq (10^7 - 10^9) \text{ K}$. These are greater than the crystallization temperatures estimated above. For this, it's unjustified to approximate the thermal energy of the ions by its classical expression $3k_B T/2$, as it was done in the denominator of (2)².

²Note that for the system of carbon nuclei we would obtain the crystallization temperature $T_{\text{cryst}} \simeq 6 \cdot (10^6 - 10^7) \text{ K}$, and the corresponding critical temperatures $T_c \simeq 2 \cdot (10^6 - 10^8) \text{ K}$. Thus, for the low densities the crystallization temperature exceeds the critical one, and the carbon

Perhaps the most important quantum effect, that invalidates the predictions of (2), is related to the zero-point fluctuations: Even at very low temperatures, close to the absolute zero, there will be a significant amount of energy stored in the quantum mechanical zero-point oscillations of the nuclei in a would-be crystal. This energy can be approximated as follows (see, e.g., [1]):

$$E_0 = \frac{3}{2}\omega_0^{ions} \equiv \frac{3}{2}\frac{\omega_p^{ions}}{\sqrt{3}} = \left(\frac{3J_0(Ze)^2}{4m_H Z}\right)^{1/2} \simeq (3 \cdot 10^3 - 10^5) \text{ eV}, \quad (4)$$

where $m_H \simeq 3.7 \text{ GeV}$ is the helium nucleus mass, and ω_p^{ions} denotes the ion plasma frequency. This energy is commensurate with the classical thermal energy at temperatures $(2/3)(3 \cdot 10^7 - 10^9) \text{ K}$ – the values that are greater than the crystallization temperatures obtained from (2).

The above discussions suggest that a measure of coupling in such a cold plasma is the ratio of the Coulomb energy to the zero-point energy. This ratio, properly normalized to be consistent with the conventions of [1] (which are different from ours), takes a small value that is not enough for the plasma to crystallize. It increases with the nuclear charge Z , and the atomic number A . Thus, for heavier nuclei, it will be high-enough not to obstruct the crystallization. In the charged helium-4 case with the densities at hand, however, the zero-point oscillations would melt the crystal lattice³.

The above considerations lead us to conclude that the dense system of the helium-4 nuclei and electrons may not solidify, mostly because of the zero-point oscillations of the helium nuclei.

2 Charged condensation

What could then be an adequate description of the quantum state discussed above? It was argued in Ref. [9] that a state in which the charged helium-4 nuclei form a Bose-Einstein (BE) condensate, while the degenerate electrons neutralize the net charge of the condensate, represents a local equilibrium state of the system.

solidification would take place. For the higher densities the opposite statement would be true. One should note, however, that we're comparing these for a fixed electron number-density in the helium and carbon cases, which implies three times greater mass density for the carbon case, so the comparisons should be readjusted by this factor. Since the carbon cores is not a subject of the present paper, we will not deal with this procedure here.

³The case for the crystallization is worsened further by the fact that for the relativistic electrons with the Fermi energy $E_F \simeq (3\pi^2 J_0)^{1/3}$, the Coulomb interaction gets screened. The screening in such a plasma becomes effective at scales of the order the Debye wavelength, $\lambda_D \sim (E_F/e^2 J_0)^{1/2} \sim (e^3 J_0)^{-1/3}$, and can be appreciable at the scale of the average inter-particle separation d . Hence, not only the denominator in (2) should be modified, but also the numerator should be reduced (multiplied by a factor) to account for the screening. The question of how significantly in the (ultra)relativistic case this screening may affect the crystallization of the carbon nuclei is left open. Note that this screening can be important in a nonrelativistic setup as well, see, e.g., Ref. [4].

The helium nuclei could have condensed to such a state when their de Broglie wavelength started to overlap, which according to our estimates above happened before the temperature dropped to the would-be crystallization value. Such a state of the helium nuclei cannot be resolved into individual particles. It represents a macroscopic mode with a large occupation number, somewhat similar to a quantum liquid of charged particles, where the charge is screened. This state, referred to as charged condensate, has a number of distinctive signatures: a photon propagating through this medium slows down, since it acquires a Lorentz-violating mass term, and its longitudinal polarization exhibits unusual dispersion relation. Moreover, electric charges in this medium, were shown in [9], are screened at the distance scales $1/M$, where M for the helium-electron system denotes

$$M \equiv (2e^2 m_H J_0)^{1/4} . \quad (5)$$

Importantly, the screening takes place at scales larger than $1/M$; on the other hand, $1/M < d$ (see discussions of this in Section 3)!

In Ref. [9], however, the dynamics of the electrons was neglected, since the fermions considered there were heavier. One of the goals of the present work is to include the dynamics of electrons. We will show that the screening length can be approximated by (5), as long as $m_H \gg J_0^{1/3}$ (as it is the case here). However, we will also see that, inclusion of the electron dynamics modifies quantitatively the spectrum of small perturbations above the ground state⁴.

Before turning to these issues, let us deal with the gravitational part of the problem. From now on we consider the system at temperatures much lower than $\sim 10^7 K$, and ignore thermal effects. Thus, we discuss the electrons in the gravitational and electrostatic fields in the interior of an astrophysical object, e.g., in the core of a helium dwarf. The Fermi momentum, p_F , is related to the chemical potential μ as follows:

$$\sqrt{p_F^2 + m_e^2} + V_g + eA_0 = \mu , \quad (6)$$

where m_e is the electron mass, V_g is the (negative) gravitational potential energy per electron, and A_0 denotes the gauge potential. An average A_0 would be nonzero for a nonzero net surface charge. However, we will assume that the net charge, even if present, is small enough, so that $|eA_0| \ll |V_g|$. Then, as is well known, the overall stability of a dwarf star is due to the balance between attractive gravity and repulsive Fermi degeneracy pressure of the electrons. Thus, we briefly discuss the interplay between V_g and the Fermi energy.

⁴It was argued in Ref. [10], that there could exist long-lived spherically symmetric objects of a (sub)atomic size with the charged condensate of helium-4 nuclei and electrons in their interior that could be held together by electrodynamic forces, as long as there is a significant amount of uncompensated charge at the surface of such objects. This interesting possibility and its applications will be studied further elsewhere. Here, the force that keeps the system together is gravity.

For this one could use the Thomas-Fermi (TF) approximation: Ignore A_0 in (6), and deduce from it $p_F = ((\mu - V_g)^2 - m_e^2)^{1/2}$. Relate the latter to the number density

$$J_0 = \frac{p_F^3}{3\pi^2} = \frac{((\mu - V_g)^2 - m_e^2)^{3/2}}{3\pi^2}, \quad (7)$$

and use this expression in the Poisson equation for V_g to derive the Chandrasekhar equation⁵.

Our main interest is in local properties of particles at scales that are much smaller than the size of the star. These properties are determined by electromagnetic interactions, once the average effective chemical potential for the particles in a given homogeneous region of the star is set by the gravitational dynamics. For instance, consider a small region in the core of the star. Local distortions in the number-density (i.e., distortions in the local Fermi momentum $p_F(x)$) will cause the respective change in the local field potential $A_0(x)$, while the change in the local gravitational field is negligible since the gravity is so much weaker.

These arguments can be formalized by the following relation:

$$\sqrt{p_F^2(x) + m_e^2} + eA_0(x) = \langle \mu - V_g(x) \rangle \equiv \mu_f, \quad (8)$$

where the brackets, $\langle \dots \rangle$, denote the averaging of the large-scale gravity effects, over the region of a roughly uniform number density in the star. Hence, by μ_f we denote the effective chemical potential that governs the fermion dynamics in a local approximately homogeneous region, e.g., in the core of the star. The size of the homogeneous region should be greater than the photon Compton wavelength, for our discussions below to be valid.

Having the gravity part dealt with, let us turn to the microscopic non-gravitational physics. For a large number of quanta that form a macroscopic state, such as the charged condensate, the description in terms of the effective field theory of the order parameter, and its long wavelength fluctuations, becomes adequate. The effective field theory will be constructed based on the fundamental principles of symmetries and properties of the interactions involved. This is the formalism that we will adopt for the rest of the work.

The effective Lagrangian that captures the microscopic properties of the system contains the photon field A_μ , a charged scalar field ϕ , and fermions Ψ^+ , Ψ , with the effective chemical potential μ_f discussed above

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2 + |\tilde{D}_\mu\phi|^2 - m_H^2\phi^*\phi + \bar{\Psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m_e)\Psi + \mu_f\Psi^+\Psi. \quad (9)$$

In a conventional setup, upon quantization, the fluctuations of ϕ would describe the helium-4 nucleus of charge $+2e$, and its antiparticle. Such a description would

⁵Since this equation and its consequences are well studied, we'll not discuss them here. For its derivation in the TF approach, and further details see, Ref. [11], and references therein.

be valid at densities that are above the atomic, but well below the nuclear scales. Here, instead, the vacuum expectation value of the field ϕ will serve as an order parameter for the condensation of the helium-4 nuclei, thus describing a state with a large occupation number. Because of this large number, the description of such a quantum state in terms of the classical field is valid. Fluctuations of the order parameter will be discussed below.

The fermions in (9) describe the (quasi) electrons with charge $-e$, and (quasi) positrons. The covariant derivative for them is defined as $D_\mu = \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu$, while for the scalar it reads

$$\tilde{D}_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu - 2ie\tilde{A}_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu - i(2eA_\mu + \mu_s\delta_{\mu 0}). \quad (10)$$

The latter is equivalent to the introduction of the chemical potential μ_s for the helium-4 nuclei.

The Lagrangian (9) has a global $U_s(1)$ symmetry, yielding the conservation of the number of scalars, as well as another global $U_f(1)$, responsible for the fermion number conservation. One linear combination of these two symmetries is gauged, and the corresponding conserved current is coupled to the photon field. We could add the quartic scalar self-interaction term to (9), but this won't change our results significantly, as long as the quartic coupling is not strong, and $m_H \gg J_0^{1/3}$.

Since the electrons are relativistic, the quantum loops would renormalize the effective Lagrangian (9) by generating additional terms proportional to the fermion chemical potential and temperature, which would be still consistent with the symmetries of the theory. These terms would come suppressed by the fine structure constant, $e^2/4\pi$, and we do not expect them to modify our quantitative results significantly in the regime when $m_H \gg J_0^{1/3}$. Hence, for simplicity of presentation we do not include those terms here.

For further convenience, we introduce the following notation for the scalar field, $\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma e^{i\alpha}$, and work in the unitary gauge where the phase of the scalar is set to zero, $\alpha = 0$. In this gauge, the Lagrangian density reads:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\sigma)^2 + \frac{(2e)^2}{2}\tilde{A}_\mu^2\sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_H^2\sigma^2 + \bar{\Psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m_e)\Psi + \mu_f\Psi^+\Psi. \quad (11)$$

The kinetic term for the scalar in (9) gives rise to the third term in the Lagrangian (11). If the field \tilde{A}_0 acquires an expectation value, this term plays the role of a tachyonic mass for the scalars (see, e.g., [12]). In particular, when $\langle 2e\tilde{A}_0 \rangle = m_H$, the scalar field condenses. That is to say, the equations of motion that follow from (11) have the following static solution:

$$\langle 2eA_0 \rangle + \mu_s = m_H, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{J_0}{2m_H}}. \quad (12)$$

What fixes the value of A_0 is the net surface charge. In particular, when the surface charge is absent, $\langle 2eA_0 \rangle = 0$, and has to be $\mu_s = m_H$, for the condensation to occur.

The system is neutral in the bulk, as the charge in the condensate is exactly canceled by the electron charge [9].

Dynamically, the condensation proceeds in a conventional manner: At temperatures higher than T_c most of the states are in thermal modes, and $\mu_s(T)$ is less than m_H , but increases as the temperature drops⁶. As $T \rightarrow T_c$ a significant fraction of the modes ends up in the zero momentum ground state, while $\mu_s(T_c)$ asymptotes to m_H (for a discussion of relativistic BE condensation, see, e.g., [13]).

The last comment in this section is that we're looking at the effects of the condensate that are $1/m_H$ suppressed. In particular, the order parameter of the condensation that we're discussing (given in eq. (12)) is the $1/m_H$ suppressed quantity. Clearly, in order for the condensate to make sense at some fixed nonzero temperature T , the de Broglie wavelength of the bosons, $\sim 1/\sqrt{m_H T}$, should be larger than the inter-particle separation – the condition which would break down for very large m_H (in agreement with the decoupling), but is fulfilled for the values of the parameters in our case. Furthermore, the inverse of the order parameter $\langle \sigma \rangle$ should be smaller than the physical size of the system – the condition that would also be violated for some very large m_H (consistent with the decoupling), but is preserved in our case.

3 Charge screening and small perturbations

As a next step we'd like to discuss screening of a probe electric charge in the condensate. To determine the screening length we consider a small, spherically symmetric object with a nonzero charge placed in the condensate. Outside of the charge, in the condensate, the equations of motion for a static A_0 and σ , as derived from (9) are:

$$-\nabla^2 \tilde{A}_0 + 4e^2 \sigma^2 \tilde{A}_0 = eJ_0, \quad -\nabla^2 \sigma = (4e^2 \tilde{A}_0^2 - m_H^2) \sigma. \quad (13)$$

Following [9] we parametrize the perturbations as follows:

$$\tilde{A}_0(r) = \frac{m_H}{2e} + \delta A_0(r), \quad \sigma(r) = \sqrt{\frac{J_0}{2m_H}} + \delta \sigma(r). \quad (14)$$

To include the effects of the fermion fluctuations we substitute $J_0 = (p_F^3/3\pi^2)$ on the r.h.s. of the first equation in (13), and express p_F in terms of the gauge potential A_0 , and the effective chemical potential μ_f via (8). The result is that $\delta J_0(r)$ gets related to δA_0 . Thus, the coefficient in front of δA_0 in the final equation for the perturbations gets modified as compared to [9]

$$-\nabla^2 \delta A_0 + e^2 \left[\frac{2J_0}{m_H} + \frac{(3\pi^2 J_0)^{2/3}}{\pi^2} \right] \delta A_0 = -2M^2 \delta \sigma, \quad (15)$$

⁶Here we ignore the temperature dependence of m_H which would be present due to the quantum loop effects.

$$-\nabla^2\delta\sigma = 2M^2\delta A_0. \quad (16)$$

The above approximation is valid as long as we focus on solutions that satisfy $\delta\sigma \ll \sqrt{J_0/2m_H}$ and $\delta A_0 \ll m_H/2e$.

In the regime when $m_H \gg J_0^{1/3}$, we find that $M^2 \gg J_0^{2/3}$, and then we can neglect the second term on the l.h.s. in (15). For large r we require that $\delta A_0, \delta\sigma \rightarrow 0$. The solutions are similar to those of [9], in which the boundary conditions select the decaying functions:

$$\delta A_0(r) = \frac{e^{-Mr}}{r} [c_1 \sin(Mr) + c_2 \cos(Mr)], \quad (17)$$

$$\delta\sigma(r) = \frac{e^{-Mr}}{r} [-c_1 \cos(Mr) + c_2 \sin(Mr)]. \quad (18)$$

The constants c_1 and c_2 are to be determined by matching these solutions to those in the interior of the small, charged object. Thus, for a probe particle, the screening occurs at scales greater than $1/M$. For the helium-electron system at hand, $1/M$ is larger than the size of the helium nuclei, but is shorter than the average inter-particle separation d . The latter statement needs some qualifications. The effective field theory description adopted above is not expected to hold at scales below d . There is an explanation of this in terms of a cancellation between the potentials due to the two long-wavelength modes – Coulomb and “phonon” quasiparticles – both of which are much lighter than $1/d$, and are well-within the validity of the effective field theory. This and related issues will be discussed in detail elsewhere. Here we only consider phenomena at scales greater than d , where screening (17), (18) is significant, and the effective field theory description is valid.

The magnetic interactions for the fermions filling the Fermi sphere, are not screened at scale M^{-1} . Instead, as it will be clear from the Lagrangian (19) derived below, the magnetic interactions are screened at scale of the Compton wavelength of the massive photon. This scale will end up being much greater than the average inter-particle separation d .

Let us now turn to the spectrum of small perturbations. The electrons fill the Fermi surface with the Fermi energy E_F . As to the bosons, there are three components of the massive photon, and the heavy scalar mode. We “integrate out” the fermions by taking into account their effect via the TF approximation, like we did it above for the static case. The resulting Lagrangian density for the bosonic perturbations takes the form:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}} = -\frac{1}{4}f_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_0^2(\delta A_0)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_\gamma^2(\delta A_j)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\delta\sigma)^2 + 2M^2\delta A_0\delta\sigma, \quad (19)$$

where $f_{\mu\nu}$ denotes the field strength for δA_μ , $j = 1, 2, 3$ is the spatial index and

$$m_0^2 \equiv m_\gamma^2 + \frac{e^2(3\pi^2 J_0)^{2/3}}{\pi^2}, \quad m_\gamma \equiv 2e\sqrt{\frac{J_0}{2m_H}}. \quad (20)$$

The calculation of the spectrum is a bit lengthy but straightforward. The result is as follows: The two (out of three) helicities of the massive photon are transverse and propagate according to the massive dispersion relation

$$\omega^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 + m_\gamma^2, \quad (21)$$

where \mathbf{k} denotes the spatial three momentum. Furthermore, there are two modes with the dispersion relations

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\pm^2 &= \mathbf{k}^2 \left(\frac{m_0^2 + m_\gamma^2}{2m_0^2} \right) + \frac{2M^4}{m_0^2} + \frac{m_\gamma^2}{2} \\ &\pm \sqrt{4\mathbf{k}^2 \frac{M^4 m_\gamma^2}{m_0^4} + \left[\frac{2M^4}{m_0^2} - \frac{m_\gamma^2}{2} + \mathbf{k}^2 \left(\frac{m_0^2 - m_\gamma^2}{2m_0^2} \right) \right]^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The solution with the plus subscript corresponds to the scalar mode and its mass squared in this frame is $\omega_+^2(\mathbf{k} = 0) = (4M^4/m_0^2)$, while the solution with the minus subscript corresponds to the longitudinal component of the massive vector field, with $\omega_-^2(\mathbf{k} = 0) = m_\gamma^2$. Here it is useful to note that the expression for M (5) can be rewritten as $M = (m_H m_\gamma)^{1/2}$.

Furthermore, in the limit when the fermions are non-dynamical (i.e., are frozen “by hand” or some other dynamics), then $m_0 \rightarrow m_\gamma$, and the solutions reduce to the ones obtained in [9], however, in the present setup the difference between m_0 and m_γ is greater than m_γ . Therefore, the fermion dynamics contributes by an additional screening of the electrostatic interactions.

The solutions (21) and (22) are positive for arbitrary \mathbf{k} . From this, we conclude that the charged condensate background is stable w.r.t. small perturbations. All the group velocities obtained from (21) and (22) are subluminal.

4 Brief discussions and outlook

The spectrum of bosons exhibits a mass gap. As a result, contributions of the bosons into the specific heat of the substance at low temperatures would be suppressed as $\exp(-m_\gamma/T)$, or stronger. Since for the densities at hand $m_\gamma \simeq (30 - 90) \text{ KeV}$, (corresponding to $\sim (3 - 9) \cdot 10^8 \text{ K}$) the exponential suppression will be strong at lower temperatures.

As the star cools further, the specific heat will be dominated by the contributions of the relativistic electrons near the Fermi surface, and, hence, would vanish with the temperature linearly, $\sim T$. This resembles the low temperature scaling in metals, but differs from that in insulating solids, or in the BE condensate of the neutral helium-4 atoms, where the low temperature specific heat is dominated by massless phonons, and scales as $\sim T^3$.

If charged condensate is realized in the helium dwarf stars, as we have argued in this work, there may be important consequences for the equation of state, cooling,

rotation, as well as the asteroseismology of the helium dwarfs. These and related issues will be studied elsewhere.

We are grateful to Stefan Hofmann, Juan Maldacena and Hector Rubinstein for stimulating questions, and to Nima Arkani-Hamed, Igor Klebanov and Andrew MacFadyen for useful discussions. GG thanks Igor Klebanov and Physics Department of Princeton University for hospitality, and the NSF and NASA for grant support (PHY-0758032, NNGG05GH34G). RAR acknowledges the James Arthur graduate fellowship support.

References

- [1] S.L. Shapiro and S. A. Teukolsky, *“Black Holes, White Dwarfs, and Neutron Stars”*, John Wiley & Sons, (1983).
- [2] L. Mestel and M.A. Ruderman, MNRAS, **136**:27 (1967).
- [3] D.Q. Lamb and H.M. Van Horn, Ap.J. **200**:306 (1975).
- [4] S. Ichimaru, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54**:1017 (1982).
- [5] G.S. Stringfellow, H.E. DeWitt, W.I. Slattery, Phys. Lett. **A 41**, 1105 (1990).
- [6] G. Chabrier, Ap.J. **414**:695 (1993).
- [7] B.M.S. Hansen and J. Liebert, Ann.Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **41**: 465 (2003).
- [8] G. Chabrier, N.W. Ashcroft, and H.E. DeWitt, Nature, **360**,48 (1992)
- [9] G. Gabadadze and R. A. Rosen, Phys Lett. B **658**, 266 (2008).
- [10] G. Gabadadze and R. A. Rosen, Phys. Lett. B **666**, 277 (2008)
- [11] N. Straumann, *“General relativity with Applications to Astrophysics”*, Springer-Verlag, (2004)
- [12] A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 3345 (1976).
- [13] H. E. Haber and H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 502 (1982).