

FFLO state with angle-dependent gap in Asymmetric Nuclear Matter

Xin-le Shang,^{1,2,*} Pei Wang,^{1,3} Peng Yin,^{1,3} and Wei Zuo^{1,2}

¹*Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou 730000, China*

²*State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

³*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049, People's Republic of China*

Abstract

We consider the FFLO state with angle-dependent gap (ADG) for arbitrary angle θ_0 between the direction of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG in asymmetric nuclear matter. We find two kinds of locally stable states, i.e., the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal and FFLO-ADG-Parallel states, which correspond to $\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\theta_0 = 0$, respectively. Furthermore, the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state is located at low asymmetry, whereas the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state is favored for large asymmetry. The critical isospin asymmetry α_c , where the superfluid vanishes, is enhanced largely by considering the Cooper pair momentum with ADG.

PACS numbers: 21.65.Cd, 74.81.-g, 26.60.-c, 74.20.Fg

*shangxinle@impcas.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutron-proton (n-p) pair correlations are potentially important in a number of physical contexts, including the mechanism of the deuteron formation in heavy-ion collisions[1] at intermediate energies and supernova[2–4]. In the context of nuclear structure, as evidenced by the recent experimental findings[5] on excited states in ^{92}Pd , heavy nuclei may feature spin-aligned n-p pairs, and moreover the exotic nuclei with extended halos provide a locus for n-p pairing. In addition, the n-p pairing may play a major role in determining the cooling and rotation dynamics in the model of “nucleon stars” which permits pion or kaon condensation[6].

The occurrence of the n-p pairing crucially depends on the overlap between the neutron and proton Fermi surfaces. The pairing correlation is suppressed when the system is driven out of the isospin-symmetric case. At low temperature, the thermal smearing of the Fermi surfaces promotes the pairing, but, is ineffective when the separation between the two Fermi surfaces is large compared to the temperature. However, a shift of the neutron and proton Fermi spheres with respect to each other, which results in a nonzero total momentum of the Cooper pairs, is expected to enhance the overlap between the two Fermi surfaces. The overlap region then provides the kinematical phase space for pairing phenomena to occur. In this configuration space such a condensate forms a periodic lattice with finite shear modulus. The resulting inhomogeneous superconducting state is called FFLO state[7, 8]. Another possible mechanism enhancing the overlap between the separated Fermi surfaces of neutron and proton in asymmetric nuclear matter is the deformation of the two Fermi surfaces[9, 10], which causes the formation of DFS (deformed Fermi surfaces) state. Both these two kinds of configurations imply an anisotropic quasiparticle spectrum. On the other hand, the previous studies of the DFS state[10] and the FFLO state[11] adopt the angle-averaging procedure which has been proved to be a quite good approximation in symmetry nuclear matter[12] by considering the pairing gap as an isotropic one. In fact, our previous work[13] indicates the angle dependence of the pairing gap should be taken into account when calculating the pairing gap in asymmetric nuclear matter at low temperature. In Ref.[13], we have proposed an axi-symmetric angle-dependent gap (ADG) state which corresponds to the axi-symmetric deformation of the neutron and proton Fermi spheres. In the ADG state, the rotational symmetry is broken spontaneously and there exists a symmetry breaking

axis. While in the FFLO configuration, both the rotational and translational symmetries are spontaneously broken and the axis of symmetry breaking is along the direction of the total Cooper pair momentum. To determinate the structure of the true ground state for bulk isospin-asymmetric nuclear matter, we should consider the FFLO and ADG state together within the same model as done in Ref.[11, 13].

The purpose of the present paper is a combined treatment of the FFLO and the axi-symmetric angle-dependent gap (ADG) phases within the same model as in Ref.[11, 13] for asymmetric nuclear matter. Arbitrary angles between the two symmetry breaking axes are considered to find out the favored angle for the ground state. In the calculations we only take into account the 3SD_1 partial-wave channel, which dominates the pairing interaction at low density[14–19]. The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II we derive the gap equations within the Gorkov formalism, which include the effects of the finite momentum of the Cooper pairs and the axi-symmetric angle dependence of pairing gap. The numerical solutions of these equations are shown in Sec. III, where we discuss the phase diagram of the combined FFLO and ADG states and their properties for different angles between two symmetry breaking axes at finite temperature. We finish in Sec. IV with a summary of our results and present our conclusions.

II. FORMALISM

At low densities, the isospin singlet 3SD_1 pairing channel dominates the attractive pairing force. In this case we can consider 3SD_1 channel alone, and the gap function can be expanded[12, 20] according to

$$\Delta_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{l, m_j} \Delta_l^{m_j}(k) [G_l^{m_j}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})]_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}, \quad (1)$$

with the elements of the spin-angle matrices

$$[G_l^{m_j}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})]_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} \equiv \langle \frac{1}{2}\sigma_1, \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2 | 1\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \rangle \langle 1\sigma_1 + \sigma_2, l m_l | 1 m_j \rangle Y_l^{m_l}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}), \quad (2)$$

where m_j and m_l are the projections of the total angular momentum $j = 1$ and the orbit angular momentum $l = 0, 2$ of the pair, respectively. The $Y_l^{m_l}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})$ denotes the spherical harmonic with $\hat{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \mathbf{k}/k$. The anomalous density matrix follows the same expansion. Moreover

the time-reversal invariance implies,

$$\Delta_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(\mathbf{k}) = (-1)^{1+\sigma_1+\sigma_2} \Delta_{-\sigma_1, -\sigma_2}^*(\mathbf{k}). \quad (3)$$

Accordingly, the pairing gap matrix $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$ in spin space possesses the property

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k})\Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) = ID^2(\mathbf{k}), \quad (4)$$

i.e., the gap function has the structure of a ‘‘unitary triplet’’ state [12]. I is the identity matrix and $D(\mathbf{k})$ is a scalar quantity in spin space.

A. The quasiparticle spectrum

Once the isospin singlet 3SD_1 channel has been selected, the pairing gap is an isoscalar and the isospin indices can be dropped out. The proton and neutron propagators following from the solution of the Gorkov equations are ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\mathbf{G}_{\sigma, \sigma'}^{(p/n)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_m) = -\delta_{\sigma, \sigma'} \frac{i\omega_m + \xi_{\mathbf{k}} \mp \delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}{(i\omega_m + E_{\mathbf{k}}^+)(i\omega_m - E_{\mathbf{k}}^-)}, \quad (5)$$

where ω_m are the Matsubara frequencies. In the right hand side of Eq.(5), the negative and positive signs correspond to proton and neutron, respectively. The neutron-proton anomalous propagator matrix in spin space has the form

$$\mathbf{F}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}, \omega_m) = -\frac{\Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k})}{(i\omega_m + E_{\mathbf{k}}^+)(i\omega_m - E_{\mathbf{k}}^-)}. \quad (6)$$

The quasiparticle excitation spectra are determined by finding the poles of the propagators in the Gorkov equations,

$$E_{\mathbf{k}}^\pm = \sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}Tr(\Delta\Delta^\dagger) \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{[Tr(\Delta\Delta^\dagger)]^2 - 4\det(\Delta\Delta^\dagger)} \pm \delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\xi_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^p + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^n)$, and $\delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^p - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^n)$. The single-particle energy spectra (in this paper we consider the free single particle energy spectrum) of neutron and proton are given by

$$\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)} = \frac{(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{k})^2}{2m} - \mu^{(n)}, \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(p)} = \frac{(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{k})^2}{2m} - \mu^{(p)},$$

with the chemical potential for neutrons and protons $\mu^{(n/p)}$ which are derived selfconsistently from the BCS theory. The neutron and proton Fermi spheres are shifted with respect to

each other and the Cooper pairs have a total pair momentum $2\mathbf{Q}$. The symmetric and asymmetric parts of the spectrum (which are even and odd with respect to the time-reversal symmetry) are performed as

$$\xi_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{2m} + \frac{\mathbf{Q}^2}{2m} - \mu, \quad \delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \delta\mu - \frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{Q}}{2m}. \quad (8)$$

Here $\mu = (\mu^{(n)} + \mu^{(p)})/2$ and $\delta\mu = (\mu^{(n)} - \mu^{(p)})/2$ are the average and relative chemical potentials, respectively. The $\frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{Q}}{2m}$ term due to the Cooper pair momentum reduces the suppression from the mismatched Fermi surface $\delta\mu$ in certain directions. Using the ‘‘unitary’’ property Eq. (4), the quasiparticle spectra can be simplified as follows

$$E_{\mathbf{k}}^{\pm} \equiv E^{\pm}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{Q}) = \sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + D^2(\mathbf{k})} \pm \delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}. \quad (9)$$

The limit $\delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to the BCS pairing in symmetric nuclear matter, whereas in asymmetric nuclear matter the spectra Eq.(9) split into two branches due to the isospin asymmetry ($\delta\mu \neq 0$) and the finite-momentum of the Cooper pair ($\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$).

B. The FFLO-ADG gap equations

In the present ‘‘unitary triplet’’ case, the gap equation at finite temperature can be written in the standard form

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{Q}) = & - \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \sum_{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2} \langle \mathbf{k}\sigma_1, -\mathbf{k}\sigma_2 | V | \mathbf{k}'\sigma'_1, -\mathbf{k}'\sigma'_2 \rangle \\ & \times \frac{\Delta_{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2}(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{Q})}{2\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}'}^2 + D^2(\mathbf{k}')}} [1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}'}^+) - f(E_{\mathbf{k}'}^-)], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $f(E) = [1 + \exp(\beta E)]^{-1}$ is the Fermi distribution function and V is the interaction in the 3SD_1 channel. $\beta^{-1} = k_B T$, where k_B is the Boltzmann constant and T is the temperature. It is worth noting that the orientation of \mathbf{Q} only affects the value of $\delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ in Eq.(9) through the angle between \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{k}' . Using the properties of spherical harmonics, we can express $\delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} &= \delta\mu - \frac{\mathbf{k}' \cdot \mathbf{Q}}{2m} = \delta\mu - \frac{k' Q}{2m} \cos(\widehat{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{Q}}) \\ &= \delta\mu - \frac{k' Q}{2m} [\sin \theta_0 \sin \theta \cos(\varphi - \varphi_0) + \cos \theta_0 \cos \theta], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where (θ_0, φ_0) and (θ, φ) are the directions of \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{k}' in the spherical coordinate respectively. As a constant phase angle, φ_0 can be eliminated by choosing a special spherical coordinate in which the direction of \mathbf{Q} represents as $(\theta_0, \varphi_0 = 0)$. Only θ_0 as a parameter determines the direction of \mathbf{Q} .

Substituting the expansion Eq.(1) into Eq.(4) and Eq.(10), one gets a set of coupled equations for the quantities $\Delta_l^{m_j}(k, Q, \theta_0)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_l^{m_j}(k, Q, \theta_0) &= \frac{-1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dk' k'^2 \sum_{l'=0,2} i^{l'-l} V_\lambda^{l'l}(k', k) \sum_{l''\mu} \Delta_{l''}^\mu(k', Q, \theta_0) \\ &\times \int d\Omega_{\mathbf{k}'} Tr[G_{l'}^{m_j*}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}') G_{l''}^\mu(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')] \frac{1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}'}^+) - f(E_{\mathbf{k}'}^-)}{\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}'}^2 + D^2(\mathbf{k}')}} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} D^2(\mathbf{k}) &= \frac{1}{2} Tr(\Delta \Delta^\dagger) \\ &= \sum_{l'=0,2} \sum_{m_j m_{j'}} \Delta_l^{m_j*}(k, Q, \theta_0) \Delta_{l'}^{m_{j'}}(k, Q, \theta_0) Tr[G_l^{m_j\dagger}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) G_{l'}^{m_{j'}}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where

$$V_\lambda^{l'l}(k', k) \equiv \langle k' | V_\lambda^{l'l} | k \rangle = \int_0^\infty r^2 dr j_{l'}(k'r) V_\lambda^{l'l}(r) j_l(kr) \quad (14)$$

are the matrix elements of the NN interaction in different partial wave ($\lambda = T, S, l, l'$) channels. In the present calculation, λ corresponds to the coupled 3SD_1 channel.

In Ref.[13], we have proposed an axi-symmetric $D^2(\mathbf{k})$ solution with an axi-symmetric deformation of the neutron and proton Fermi spheres. The axi-symmetric $D^2(\mathbf{k})$ corresponds to the $m_j = 0$ gap components of $\Delta_l^{m_j}(k)$ only. Moreover, the relations $\Delta_l^{m_j*}(k, Q, \theta_0) = -(-1)^{m_j} \Delta_l^{-m_j}(k, Q, \theta_0)$ from Eq.(3) yield,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_0^0(k, Q, \theta_0) &= i\delta_0(k, Q, \theta_0), \\ \Delta_2^0(k, Q, \theta_0) &= i\delta_2(k, Q, \theta_0). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Then we can write the axisymmetric $D^2(\mathbf{k})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} D^2(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0) &= \frac{1}{2} A(\theta) [\delta_0(k, Q, \theta_0)]^2 \\ &\quad - B(\theta) \delta_0(k, Q, \theta_0) \delta_2(k, Q, \theta_0) + \frac{1}{2} C(\theta) [\delta_2(k, Q, \theta_0)]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A(\theta) &= \text{Tr}[G_0^{0\dagger}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')G_0^0(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')] = \frac{1}{4\pi}, \\
B(\theta) &= -\text{Tr}[G_0^{0\dagger}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')G_2^0(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')] \\
&= -\text{Tr}[G_2^{0\dagger}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')G_0^0(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8\pi}(3\cos^2\theta - 1), \\
C(\theta) &= \text{Tr}[G_2^{0\dagger}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')G_2^0(\hat{\mathbf{k}}')] = \frac{1}{8\pi}(3\cos^2\theta + 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The θ dependent $D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)$ is independent of φ and maintains the rotational symmetry [denoted as O(2) symmetry] along the axis ($\theta = 0, \varphi = 0$) (the symmetry-axis of ADG), which is also the O(3) symmetry breaking axis. The pair momentum $2\mathbf{Q}$ breaks both rotational and translational symmetries and the symmetry breaking axis is ($\theta = \theta_0, \varphi = 0$). The angle between the two symmetry breaking axes is θ_0 and the two axes are parallel/perpendicular to each other when $\theta_0 = 0/\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

Introducing the normalization

$$\Delta_s(k, Q, \theta_0) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{8\pi}}\delta_0(k, Q, \theta_0), \Delta_d(k, Q, \theta_0) = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{8\pi}}\delta_2(k, Q, \theta_0), \tag{18}$$

one gets the $m_j = 0$ components of the gap equations from Eq.(12) with finite Cooper pair momentum for the FFLO-ADG state

$$\begin{aligned}
&\begin{pmatrix} \Delta_s \\ \Delta_d \end{pmatrix}(k, Q, \theta_0) = \frac{-1}{\pi} \int dk' k'^2 \begin{pmatrix} V^{00} & V^{02} \\ V^{20} & V^{22} \end{pmatrix}(k, k') \\
&\times \int d\Omega_{\mathbf{k}'} \frac{1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}'}^+) - f(E_{\mathbf{k}'}^-)}{\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}'}^2 + D^2(k', \theta, Q, \theta_0)}} \begin{pmatrix} A(\theta) & B(\theta) \\ B(\theta) & C(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_s \\ \Delta_d \end{pmatrix}(k', Q, \theta_0),
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where V^{00} , V^{02} , V^{20} , V^{22} are defined in Eq.(14) with $l, l' = 0, 2$ and the quasiparticle spectrum is

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\mathbf{k}}^\pm &= \sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)} \\
&\pm [\delta\mu - \frac{k'Q}{2m}(\sin\theta_0 \sin\theta \cos\varphi + \cos\theta_0 \cos\theta)].
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The axi-symmetric $D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)$ is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0) &= \Delta_s^2(k, Q, \theta_0) + \Delta_d^2(k, Q, \theta_0) \left[\frac{3\cos^2\theta + 1}{2} \right] \\
&+ \sqrt{2}\Delta_s(k, Q, \theta_0)\Delta_d(k, Q, \theta_0)[3\cos^2\theta - 1].
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The two coupled components Δ_s and Δ_d represent the 3S_1 and 3D_1 channel gaps, respectively. At variance with the discussion in Ref.[11], the orientation of the Cooper pair momentum may affect the quasiparticle excitation and the system becomes more asymmetric if the two symmetry breaking axes are not parallel to each other.

Following Eq.(5), we can get the neutron and proton densities,

$$\rho^{(p/n)} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} n_{\sigma}^{(p/n)}(\mathbf{k}), \quad (22)$$

with their distributions

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\sigma}^{(p/n)}(\mathbf{k}) = & \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}}{\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)}} \right) f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^{\pm}) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}}{\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)}} \right) [1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mp})] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Summation over frequencies in Eq.(6) leads to the density matrix of the particles in the condensate,

$$\nu_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(\mathbf{k}, Q, \theta_0) = \frac{\Delta_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(\mathbf{k}, Q, \theta_0)}{2\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)}} [1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^+) - f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^-)]. \quad (24)$$

For asymmetric nuclear matter, the coupled equations (19) and (22) should be solved self-consistently with the expressions (20) and (21) for the FFLO-ADG state. In our calculation, the total Cooper pair momentum $2Q$ and the angle θ_0 are treated as variational parameters to be determined from the ground state energy of the system.

C. Thermodynamics

For asymmetric nuclear matter at a fixed finite temperature and given neutron and proton densities, the total density $\rho = (\rho^{(n)} + \rho^{(p)})$ and the isospin asymmetry $\alpha = (\rho^{(n)} - \rho^{(p)})/\rho$ are fixed. The thermodynamic quantity describing the system is the free energy defined as

$$F|_{\rho, \beta} = U - TS, \quad (25)$$

where U is the internal energy and S is the entropy. A thermodynamically stable state minimizes the difference between the free energies of the superconducting and normal states, $\delta f = F_s - F_n$. In the mean-field approximation, the entropy of the superfluid state is

$$\begin{aligned} S_s = -2k_B \sum_{\mathbf{k}} & \{ f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^+) \ln f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^+) + \bar{f}(E_{\mathbf{k}}^+) \ln \bar{f}(E_{\mathbf{k}}^+) \\ & + f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^-) \ln f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^-) + \bar{f}(E_{\mathbf{k}}^-) \ln \bar{f}(E_{\mathbf{k}}^-) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\bar{f}(E_{\mathbf{k}}^{\pm}) = 1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^{\pm})$ and the summation is over the momentum states in quasiparticle approximation. Taking the limit $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, we get the entropy S_n in the normal state. The mean-field internal energy of the superfluid state reads

$$\begin{aligned}
U &= \sum_{\sigma \mathbf{k}} [\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)} n_{\sigma}^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}) + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(p)} n_{\sigma}^{(p)}(\mathbf{k})] \\
&+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma'_1, \sigma'_2} \langle \mathbf{k} \sigma_1, -\mathbf{k} \sigma_2 | V | \mathbf{k}' \sigma'_1, -\mathbf{k}' \sigma'_2 \rangle \\
&\times \nu_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}, Q, \theta_0) \nu_{\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2}(\mathbf{k}', Q, \theta_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The second term in Eq.(27) includes the BCS mean-field interaction among the particles in the condensate and can be eliminated in terms of the gap equation (10). Finally, the internal energy is written as

$$\begin{aligned}
U &= \sum_{\sigma \mathbf{k}} [\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)} n_{\sigma}^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}) + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(p)} n_{\sigma}^{(p)}(\mathbf{k})] \\
&- \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)}{\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + D^2(k, \theta, Q, \theta_0)}} [1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^+) - f(E_{\mathbf{k}}^-)].
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The first term in Eqs.(27) and (28) contains the kinetic energy of the quasiparticles which is a functional of the pairing gap. In the normal state, it can be reduced to the kinetic energy of the neutrons and protons. Noting that the introduction of the Cooper pair momentum $2\mathbf{Q}$ can enhance both the pairing energy and the kinetic energy. The competition between these two mechanisms can adjust the value and the direction of \mathbf{Q} .

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The nuclear FFLO states with ADG are studied numerically using the Argonne V_{18} potential. In the present paper, we focus on the effects due to the finite momentum of the Cooper pairs with axi-symmetric ADG and investigate the favored angle between the directions of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG. Several assumptions are adopted to simplify the calculations. First, we adopt the free single-particle (s.p.) energy spectrum, which may affect the level density of the state around Fermi surface. Second, the pairing interaction is approximated by the bare interaction, i.e., ignoring the screening effects of the pairing interaction. These two approximations may affect the absolute magnitude of the pairing gap. Moreover, we only study the coupled 3SD_1 channel which dominates the

pairing force at the considered density $\rho_0 = 0.17 fm^{-3}$. At this density, the previous studies [20–22] show that the n-p pairing gap is about 12 MeV with the free s.p. spectrum and about 5 MeV with the Brueckner-Hartree-Fock (BHF) s.p. spectrum, which seem difficult to reconcile with the empirical information available from finite nuclei. [23]. However, the n-p pairing gap is reduced to less than 0.5 MeV at density of $\rho_0 \approx 0.17 fm^{-3}$ when the energy dependence of the single-particle self-energy (within the BHF approximation) is taken into account in the gap equation [24]. In this paper, we adopt the free s.p. spectrum. In order to remove the dependence on the absolute scale of the gap, we present the results normalized to the pairing gap in the symmetric matter at zero total momentum of the pairs. The computations are carried out at the temperature $\beta^{-1} = 0.5$ MeV at which the effect of the angle dependence of the pairing gap becomes important[13]. Both the values of θ_0 and Q for the local stable state are determined by minimizing the free energy.

Fig.1 shows the pairing gap $\Delta_s(k_F)$ in the 3S_1 partial-wave channel as a function of θ_0 and Q (in units of the Fermi momentum k_F). The isospin asymmetries α are set to be 0.15, 0.25, 0.30, 0.40 in Fig.1a, Fig.1b, Fig.1c, Fig.1d, respectively. The gap is normalized to its value $\Delta_{s0} = \Delta_s(k_F)[\alpha = 0, Q = 0]$ with zero-total-momentum in symmetric nuclear matter. For the small asymmetry $\alpha = 0.15$ in Fig.1a, $\Delta_s(k_F)$ decreases monotonically as a function of Q at $\theta_0 = 0$. However, for $0.4\pi \leq \theta_0 \leq 0.5\pi$ $\Delta_s(k_F)$ takes its maximal value at $Q \neq 0$, indicating that the FFLO state can exist in the domain of θ_0 around the direction of the Cooper pair momentum perpendicular to the symmetry-axis of ADG. At the two moderate isospin asymmetries $\alpha = 0.25$ and 0.30 in Figs. 1b and 1c, the maxima of $\Delta_s(k_F)$ are located at $Q \neq 0$ for any θ_0 of $0 \leq \theta_0 \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, indicating a FFLO state for any orientation of the Cooper pair momentum. Fig.1d shows that $\Delta_s(k_F)$ take its the maximum at $Q \neq 0$ for $0 \leq \theta_0 \leq 0.28\pi$, i.e., the FFLO state exists in a narrow region of θ_0 near the direction of the Cooper pair momentum parallel to the symmetry-axis of ADG. It is also shown in Fig.1d that the pairing gap can only exist with nonzero Q , which implies only the FFLO state can survive for sufficiently large asymmetry (for example, $\alpha = 0.40$).

In the 3D_1 partial-wave channel, the pairing gap $\Delta_d(k_F)$ also plays an important role in the condensate. Therefore, we show $\Delta_d(k_F)$ as a function of θ_0 and Q (in units of the Fermi momentum k_F) in Fig.2, where the parameters are set to be the same as those in Fig.1 and the gap value is normalized to its value $\Delta_{d0} = \Delta_d(k_F)[\alpha = 0, Q = 0]$ with zero-total-momentum in symmetric nuclear matter. The shapes of the $\Delta_d(k_F)$ surfaces closely




FIG. 1: The value of $\Delta_s(k_F)$ vs θ_0 (the angle between the direction of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG) and Q (the half value of the Cooper pair momentum) in units of the Fermi momentum k_F . The pairing gap is normalized to its value in the symmetric and zero-total-momentum case Δ_{s0} at fixed density $\rho = 0.17fm^{-3}$ and temperature $\beta^{-1} = 0.5$ MeV. Figs.(a), (b), (c), (d) are related to the select isospin asymmetry $\alpha = 0.15, 0.25, 0.30, 0.40$, respectively.

resemble those of the pairing gap $\Delta_s(k_F)$ in Fig.1 except for Fig.2a. In Fig.2a, there exists a minimum of $\Delta_d(k_F)$ at a nonzero Q for $\theta_0 = 0$, which may indicate that the FFLO state can not exist for a small asymmetry when the Cooper pair momentum is parallel to the symmetry-axis of ADG.

In order to find the ground state, we calculate the free-energy difference δf between the normal and superconducting states as a function of θ_0 and Q . The results are shown in




FIG. 2: The value of $\Delta_d(k_F)$ vs θ_0 (the angle between the direction of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG) and Q (the half value of the Cooper pair momentum) in units of the Fermi momentum k_F . The pairing gap is normalized to its value in the symmetric and zero-total-momentum case Δ_{d0} at fixed density $\rho = 0.17fm^{-3}$ and temperature $\beta^{-1} = 0.5$ MeV. Figs.(a), (b), (c), (d) are related to the select isospin asymmetry $\alpha = 0.15, 0.25, 0.30, 0.40$, respectively.

Fig. 3, where the parameters are also set to the same values as those in Fig. 1. The free energy difference δf is normalized to its value at zero total momentum in symmetric matter. At $\alpha = 0.15$ in Fig.3a, the sole local minimum of δf is located at $(\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}, Q = 0.097)$, indicating that the FFLO state is stable when the direction of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG are orthogonal for a small α . Below we call this state as FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state. In Figs.3b, there exist two local minima of δf settled at




FIG. 3: The difference of the free energy of the normal and superconducting state δf as a function of θ_0 and Q , where Q have been normalized to the Fermi momentum k_F and θ_0 is the angle between the direction of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG. δf is normalized to its value in the symmetric and zero-total-momentum case $|\delta f_{00}|$ at fixed density $\rho = 0.17 fm^{-3}$ and temperature $\beta^{-1} = 0.5$ MeV. Figs.(a), (b), (c), (d) are related to the select isospin asymmetry $\alpha = 0.15, 0.25, 0.30, 0.40$, respectively.

$(\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}, Q = 0.145)$ and $(\theta_0 = 0, Q = 0.18)$, respectively. The second local minimum is related to the case that the directions of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG are parallel. We call this state FFLO-ADG-Parallel state below. For moderate asymmetries (for examples, $\alpha = 0.25, 0.30$), both the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state and the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state are locally stable. Comparing Fig.3b and Fig.3c, the FFLO-




FIG. 4: (Color online). The phase diagram as a function of asymmetry α . The red solid, black dashed and the blue dash-dotted line are related to the ADG, FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal and FFLO-ADG-Parallel state, respectively.

ADG-Orthogonal state is more stable at smaller α , whereas the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state is more favored for larger α . Fig.3d shows only the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state can survive at a sufficiently large α .

We can find from Fig.3 that the minimum of the free-energy difference δf is located either at $\theta_0 = 0$ or $\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}$. In fact, we have calculated δf by varying θ_0 and Q for different asymmetries α ($0.01 \leq \alpha \leq 0.47$). The results show the minimum of δf is related to either $\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ or $\theta_0 = 0$, indicating that only the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state and the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state are locally stable. Fig.4 displays the calculated values of the local minimum of δf vs. the asymmetry α . For comparison, the result for the ADG state corresponding to $Q = 0$ is also exhibited in Fig.4 (the red solid line). The black dashed line is related to $(\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}, Q \neq 0)$, i.e., the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state. And the blue dash-dotted line corresponds to $(\theta_0 = 0, Q \neq 0)$, i.e., the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state. For small isospin asymmetries α ($0.025 < \alpha < 0.16$), there exists only one kind of locally stable FFLO state,

i.e., the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state. With increasing α , the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state emerges above $\alpha = 0.16$, but it is not the favored state for $\alpha < 0.286$. The FFLO-ADG-Parallel state becomes more stable than the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state when $\alpha > 0.286$. At $\alpha = 0.37$, the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state vanishes, whereas the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state can exist up to $\alpha = 0.47$.

Since the contribution to superfluidity from the Cooper pairs around the average Fermi surface is dominant, for n-p pair correlation, a small separation of the neutron and proton Fermi surfaces $\delta\mu$ may suppress the superfluidity strongly. In the ADG configuration, the neutron Fermi sphere possesses an oblate deformation along the symmetry-axis of ADG, whereas the proton Fermi sphere has a prolate deformation. These two different kinds of deformation enhance the correlation between neutrons and protons near their average Fermi surface, i.e., the phase space near $(\theta = 0, \varphi = 0)$ and $(\theta = \pi, \varphi = 0)$. In the FFLO configuration, the shift of the neutron and proton Fermi spheres with respect to each other may enhance the overlap between the two Fermi surfaces. However, the influence of the Cooper pair momentum turns out to be complicated when considering the angle dependence of the pairing gap. For example, in the weakly isospin-asymmetric case, the difference between the neutron and proton Fermi surfaces $\delta\mu$ is small, and the deformation of the Fermi spheres in the ADG configuration is sufficient to compensate the effect due to this difference $\delta\mu$. As a consequence, a shift of the two Fermi spheres with respect to each other along the symmetry-axis of ADG ($\theta_0 = 0$) may even reduce the overlap of the phase-space for pairing near the average Fermi surface. Therefore, the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state could not exist for small α . Nevertheless, if the shift between the two Fermi spheres is perpendicular to the symmetry-axis of ADG, the pairing could be enhanced in three areas in the phase space, i.e., the area near $(\theta = 0, \varphi = 0)$, $(\theta = \pi, \varphi = 0)$ and $(\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}, \varphi = 0)$. Therefore, only the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state is stable for small asymmetry α .

When the asymmetry α gets large, the splitting of the neutron and proton Fermi surfaces becomes so large that its effect can not be completely compensated by the effect of the deformation of the two Fermi spheres in the ADG configuration. The Cooper pair momentum along the direction of $\theta_0 = 0$ is expected to reduce the remained splitting partially. Consequently, the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state emerges and becomes local stable. However, the splitting is not large enough to destroy the mechanism of the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state totally. Hence, both the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state and FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state




FIG. 5: (Color online). $\frac{\partial \delta f}{\partial \alpha}$ vs α . The red solid, black dashed and the blue dash-dotted line are relate to the ADG, FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal and FFLO-ADG-Parallel state, respectively.

are local stable for a moderate α . At a sufficiently large asymmetry, the neutron and proton Fermi surfaces are split so much that the deformation of the two Fermi spheres in the ADG configuration can no longer guarantee the pairing around $(\theta = 0, \varphi = 0)$ and $(\theta = \pi, \varphi = 0)$ near the average Fermi surface. Under this condition, the neutron and proton Fermi surfaces are much closer along the direction $(\theta = 0, \varphi = 0)$ than that along the direction $(\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}, \varphi = 0)$ in the ADG configuration. A shift between the two Fermi spheres along the direction $(\theta = 0, \varphi = 0)$ is much easier to promote the phase-space overlap for the pairing than that along the direction $(\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}, \varphi = 0)$, i.e., the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state is more favored than the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state for a sufficiently large α .

In Fig.4, the phase transition from the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state to the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state is of the first order. In order to investigate in detail the phase transitions in Fig.4, we calculate $\frac{\partial \delta f}{\partial \alpha}$ as function of α and the results are shown in Fig.5. At $\alpha = 0.025$, the transition from the ADG state to the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state is of the second order. But at $\alpha = 0.16$, $\frac{\partial \delta f}{\partial \alpha} |_{ADG} \neq \frac{\partial \delta f}{\partial \alpha} |_{FFLO-ADG-Parallel}$, which indicates a first-order transition

from the ADG state to the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state. In Fig.4, the three curves of ADG, FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal and FFLO-ADG-Parallel tend to zero gently near the transition points, indicating that the three transitions from the superconducting states to the normal state are of second order. Fig.5 shows $\frac{\partial \delta f}{\partial \alpha} \rightarrow 0$ near the three phase transition points, which are agreement with the results in Fig.4.

Before summary, we briefly discuss the difference between the ADG state and the DFS state. As we know, the quasiparticle spectra in both ADG and DFS states are angle-dependent. In the DFS state, the angle dependence of the quasiparticle spectrum results from the angle dependence of the deformed neutron and proton Fermi surfaces [9, 10, 25]. However, in the ADG state the pairing gap is angle-dependent due to the noncentral 3SD_1 channel pairing force [13]. And the angle-dependent pairing gap leads to the angle dependence of the quasiparticle spectrum. These two mechanisms resulting in the angle-dependent quasiparticle spectrum are different.

IV. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

The fermionic condensation in asymmetric nuclear matter leads to superconducting states with anisotropic Fermi spheres (such as the FFLO and ADG[13] states). In the ADG state, the angle dependence of the pairing gap may result in the deformation of the neutron and proton Fermi spheres. Moreover, the FFLO state corresponds to a shift of the two Fermi spheres with respect to each other. In this paper, we consider these two mechanisms together and investigate the FFLO-ADG state with arbitrary angle between the direction of the Cooper pair momentum and the symmetry-axis of ADG. Two kinds of local stable states are found. One corresponds to the direction of the pair momentum perpendicular to the symmetry-axis of ADG (the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state), the other is related to the direction of the pair momentum parallel to the symmetry-axis of ADG (the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state). It is shown the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state possesses the lowest free energy at small isospin asymmetries, whereas the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state is favored for large asymmetries. The transitions from both the ADG and FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal states to the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state are of the first order. On the contrary, the transition from the ADG state to the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state is of the second order. Moreover, the transitions from the three superconducting states (ADG, FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal and

FFLO-ADG-parallel states) to the normal state are of the second order.

In the previous studies such as Ref.[10, 11, 16, 21], the effect of the angle dependence of the pairing gap is abandoned, i.e., supposing the neutron and proton spheres as isotropic ones. Thus, the FFLO states are degenerate for arbitrary directions of the Cooper pair momentum. In fact, for the n-p pairing in asymmetric nuclear matter, the angle dependence of the pairing gap can compensate the effect due to the splitting of the neutron and proton Fermi surfaces[13]. In the axi-symmetric ADG configuration, one particular direction (the symmetry-axis of ADG) is selected. In this case, the FFLO state with angle-dependent gap is nondegenerate for the orientations of the Cooper pair momentum. Only two orientations are shown to be local stable, corresponding to the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal and FFLO-ADG-Parallel states, respectively. As pointed out in Ref.[13] that the ADG configuration is related to the deformation of the neutron and proton Fermi spheres. The FFLO-ADG-Parallel/Orthogonal state may correspond to more complicated deformation of the neutron and proton Fermi spheres. In this improved calculation, both the value of the pairing gap and the domain of α in which the superconducting state exists become large. Especially for the temperature $\beta^{-1} = 0.5$ MeV, the ADG state vanishes at $\alpha = 0.267$, whereas the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state vanishes at $\alpha = 0.47$. The combination of the FFLO and ADG states promotes the onset of n-p pairing for large asymmetry. Here we only consider the nuclear saturation density $\rho_0 = 0.17 fm^{-3}$ at the low temperature of $\beta^{-1} = 0.5$ MeV. The properties of FFLO-ADG-Parallel/Orthogonal state are expected to be similar for high densities at low temperature. At low densities and/or high temperatures the effect of the angle dependence of the pairing gap becomes weak, and the difference among the ADG, FFLO-ADG-Parallel and FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal states may become unobvious.

In ADG state, the rotational symmetry is spontaneously broken [the O(3) symmetry breaks down to the O(2) symmetry]. Moreover, the translation and rotational symmetries are both broken in the FFLO-ADG-Parallel state, however, the O(2) rotational symmetry is maintained. In the FFLO-ADG-Orthogonal state, the O(2) rotational symmetry is broken as well. As is well known, the continuous symmetry breaking leads to collective excitations with vanishing minimal frequency (Goldstone's modes). The symmetry breaking of the FFLO-ADG-Parallel/Orthogonal state may imply new complicated collective bosonic modes in asymmetric nuclear matter (except the collective motion of the Cooper pairs). We only consider the simplest FF state ($\Delta(\mathbf{r}) = \Delta e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$) with ADG in the paper. In fact, the FFLO

state is much more complicated, the structure of the true ground state remains for the future work.

Acknowledgments

The work is supported by the Special Foundation for theoretical physics Research Program of China (No. 11347151), the 973 Program of China under No. 2013CB834405, the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11435014, 11175219, 11204323), and the Knowledge Innovation Project(No. KJCX2-EW-N01) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

-
- [1] M.Baldo, U.Lombardo, P.Schuck, Phys. Rev. C **52**, 975 (1995).
 - [2] S.Heckel, P.P.Schneider, and A.Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. C. **80**, 015805 (2009).
 - [3] S.Typel, G.Röpke, T.Klähn, D.Blaschke, and H.H.Wolter, Phys. Rev. C. **81**, 015803 (2010).
 - [4] M.Stein, X.-G.Huang, A.Sedrakian, and J.W.Clark, Phys. Rev. C. **86**, 062801 (2012).
 - [5] B.Cederwall, F.G.Moradi, T.Bäck, A.Johnson, J.Blomqvist, E.Clément, G.de France, R.Wadsworth, K.Andgren, K.Lagergren, et al., Nature (London) **469**, 68 (2011).
 - [6] G.E.Brown and H.A.Bethe, Astrophys. J. **423** 659 (1994)
 - [7] P.Fulde and R.A.Ferrell, Phys. Rev. 135 (1964) A550.
 - [8] A.I.Larkin and Yu.N.Ovchinnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 47 (1964) 1136 [Sov. Phys. JETP 20 (1965) 762].
 - [9] H.Müther, and A.Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 252503 (2002).
 - [10] H.Müther, and A.Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. C. **67**, 015802 (2003).
 - [11] A.Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. C. **63**, 025801 (2001).
 - [12] M.Baldo, I.Bombaci, and U.Lombardo, Phys. Lett. B. **283**, 8 (1992).
 - [13] Xin-Le Shang, and Wei Zuo, Phys. Rev. C. **88**, 025806 (2013).
 - [14] Th.Alm, B.L.Friman, G.Röpke, and H.Schulz, Nucl. Phys. A **551**, 45 (1993).
 - [15] A.Sedrakian, Th.Alm, U.Lombardo, Phys. Rev. C **55**, R582 (1997).
 - [16] A.Sedrakian, U.Lombardo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 602 (2000).
 - [17] U.Lombardo, P.Nozières, P.Schuck, H.-J.Schulze, A.Sedrakian, Phys. Rev. C. **64**, 064314 (2001).

- [18] Ø.Elgaroy, L.Engvik, M.Hjorth-Jensen, and E.Osnes, Phys. Rev. C. **57**, R1069 (1998).
- [19] A.I.Akhiezer, A.A.Isayev, S.V.Peletminsky, and A.A.Yatsenko, Phys. Rev. C. **63**, 021304 (2001).
- [20] T.Takatsuka and R.Tamagaki, Progr. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **112** 27 (1993)
- [21] U.Lombardo, H.-J.Schulze, and W.Zuo, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 2927 (1999).
- [22] U.Lombardo, C.Shen, H.-J.Schulze, and W.Zuo Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **14** 513 (2005).
- [23] G.Röpke, A.Schnell, P.Schuck, and U.Lombardo, Phys. Rev. C **61**, 024306 (2000).
- [24] M. baldo, U.Lombardo, H.-J.Schulze, and W.Zuo, Phys. Rev. C **66**, 054304 (2002).
- [25] A.Sedrakian, J.Mur-Petit, A.Polls, and H.Müther, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 013613 (2005).