

Critical temperature for fermion pairing using lattice field theory

Matthew Wingate

Institute for Nuclear Theory, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1550, USA

(Dated: 14 November 2018)

Dilute gases of 2-component fermions are of great interest in atomic and nuclear physics. When interactions are strong enough so that a bound state is at threshold, universal behavior is expected. Lattice field theory provides a first principles approach to the study of strongly interacting systems such as this through Monte Carlo simulation. Results of exploratory simulations are presented here. In particular, the finite temperature phase transition between superfluid and normal states is studied. We present first results for the critical temperature T_c and describe the future work necessary to determine T_c as a function of interaction strength.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Ss, 11.15.Ha, 34.50.-s, 74.20.-z

The ability to trap and cool bosonic atoms so they undergo Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC) has created a unique route toward understanding fundamental properties of quantum many-body systems. Cooling fermionic atoms to the same temperatures presents additional challenges due to Pauli exclusion, but these are being overcome [1, 2].

In contrast to BEC, in which a phase transition separates classical from quantum behavior, the quantum nature of Fermi gases appears gradually as the temperature reaches the Fermi temperature T_F . A phase transition is expected for fermions which have even the slightest attraction due to the Cooper instability, but this transition will occur far below T_F . In the weak coupling limit, the system will form a Bardeen, Cooper, and Schrieffer (BCS) superfluid below the critical temperature which is exponentially small: $T_c \propto T_F \exp(-\pi/(2k_F|a|))$ [3], where a is the 2-body S wave scattering length. The Fermi momentum and temperature are defined through the number density n : $k_F \equiv (6\pi^2 n/g)^{1/3}$ and $T_F \equiv k_F^2/2$; g is the degeneracy. (We will use the natural units $\hbar = M = k_B = 1$, where M is the fermion mass.) Weak coupling implies $k_F|a| \ll 1$.

On the other hand, if the attraction between the fermions becomes large, $a \rightarrow -\infty$ and a bound state appears at threshold. As $1/a > 0$ increases, the fermions pair to form bosonic molecules which condense at a temperature which is experimentally attainable, $T_c \approx 0.3T_F$. It is conjectured that T_c will be close to T_F even at $1/a = 0$ [4]. Much progress is being made toward producing and studying atomic gases in this regime, [5, 6, 7, 8].

Furthermore, $1/a = 0$ is a special point. In this case the only finite physical length scale is the mean interparticle spacing $n^{-1/3}$, and the details of the interaction between fermions are irrelevant. All physical quantities scale like appropriate powers of n times universal constants, applicable to atomic and nuclear systems. Theoretical study of this limit is difficult because it occurs at strong coupling.

Numerical calculations have been done for this system at zero temperature using fixed-node Greens func-

tion Monte Carlo [9, 10] and fixed-node diffusion Monte Carlo [11]. Within the context of the fixed node approximation and the assumption that the initial trial wavefunction has a nonzero overlap with the physical ground state, results for the energy-per-particle and pairing gap were obtained. These calculations are done at zero temperature with fixed number of particles, up to 66 so far.

This work employs a very different Monte Carlo method based on lattice field theory [12], the same approach widely used to compute nonperturbative quantities in QCD [13]. It has several advantages over previous methods. There is no sign problem in this formulation, so the fermions can be treated exactly. No assumptions need to be made regarding the ground state. We work in the grand canonical ensemble, so the thermodynamic limit is identically the infinite volume limit. Lastly, the theory is naturally formulated for finite temperature studies.

Below we present the first numerical investigation of the fermion pairing phase transition. The method is described as pedagogically as possible within the length constraints. Computations are performed along several paths in parameters space, and we observe a sharp decrease in the order parameter for fermion pairing as the temperature is increased. These first calculations demonstrate the feasibility of using lattice field theory to locate and compute the critical temperature for fermion pairing. Theoretical errors are discussed and can be systematically removed.

We begin by considering the Hamiltonian for 2 species of equal mass particles, N_1 and N_2 in number:

$$H = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \nabla_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \nabla_j^2 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} v(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|). \quad (1)$$

If scattering between particles is limited to low energies, then the dominant contribution is the S wave. Furthermore, if the potential vanishes quickly at long distances an effective range expansion can be made for the scattering amplitude: $(-1/a + \frac{1}{2}k^2R + \dots - ik)^{-1}$, where a is the scattering length and R is the effective range of the

potential. In a dilute gas $kR \approx n^{1/3}R \ll 1$, so scattering can be completely described by a ; the short-distance details of the potential are unimportant. The potential can be replaced by a local interaction, given in second-quantized form by $\frac{1}{2}C_0(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2$, where $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2)^T$ and $\bar{\psi} = (\bar{\psi}_1, \bar{\psi}_2)$ are the fermion fields. Negative C_0 corresponds to an attractive interaction. Effective field theories have been developed which show how to systematically correct the short-distance physics should the need arise [14, 15].

We work in the grand canonical ensemble and rewrite the partition function $\mathcal{Z} = \text{Tr} \exp[-\beta(\hat{H} - \mu\hat{N})]$ as a path integral $\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \exp\left(-\int_0^\beta dx_4 \int d^3x \mathcal{L}\right)$. The fermion fields have anti-periodic boundary conditions in the imaginary time (x_4) direction. In order to eliminate the Grassmann-valued fields, we must make the Lagrange density quadratic in them. To do so an auxiliary scalar field ϕ is introduced (à la Hubbard-Stratonovich)

$$\frac{C_0}{2} (\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2 - \phi\bar{\psi}\psi \quad (2)$$

where $m^2 \equiv -C_0^{-1}$.

The Lagrangian is invariant under a global U(1) transformation $\psi \rightarrow \exp(i\alpha)\psi$, $\bar{\psi} \rightarrow \bar{\psi}\exp(-i\alpha)$. If we want to study the spontaneous breaking of this symmetry in a finite volume, we must induce an explicit breaking and compute observables in the limit of its removal. Thus we add to the Lagrangian a term proportional to a new parameter J :

$$\mathcal{L}[J] = \mathcal{L} + \frac{1}{2}(J\psi^T\sigma_2\psi + J^*\bar{\psi}\sigma_2\bar{\psi}^T). \quad (3)$$

Without loss of generality we take J to be real and define the pairing condensate $\Sigma \equiv \langle \psi^T\sigma_2\psi + \bar{\psi}\sigma_2\bar{\psi}^T \rangle / 2$. $\lim_{J \rightarrow 0}(\lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma)$ is an order parameter for the breaking of the U(1) symmetry and the emergence of a nonzero pairing condensate. For the sign convention of (3), $J > 0$ will induce $\Sigma < 0$.

\mathcal{L} is discretized on a lattice with V spatial sites and N_t sites in imaginary time; we denote the spatial and temporal lattice spacings by b_s and b_t . To perform simulations, path integrals must be manipulated into the following form [12]: Combining ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ into a 4-component fermion, $\Psi^T \equiv (\psi^T, \bar{\psi}(i\sigma_2)^T)$, the action can be written as $\Psi^T \mathcal{A} \Psi$, where the $4VN_t \times 4VN_t$ matrix \mathcal{A} is

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} -iJ & K^\dagger \\ K & -iJ^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} i\sigma_2 & 0 \\ 0 & i\sigma_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

$(K\psi)_x = (\psi_x - e^{\mu b_t}\psi_{x-\hat{e}_4}) - \frac{1}{2\xi}(\nabla^2\psi)_x - \phi_x e^{\mu b_t}\psi_{x-\hat{e}_4}$, and is the only $2VN_t \times 2VN_t$ block to contain nontrivial spacetime terms. The only coupling between species is through the $i\sigma_2$ blocks. We also introduce the anisotropy $\xi \equiv b_s^2/b_t$. The result of the integration is

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}\phi \det[|J|^2 + \tilde{K}^\dagger \tilde{K}] e^{-S_\phi} \equiv \int \mathcal{D}\phi W[\phi] \quad (5)$$

where $K \equiv \tilde{K} \otimes I_2$ defines the $VN_t \times VN_t$ matrix \tilde{K} . The important point is that W , the integrand of \mathcal{Z} , is strictly nonnegative, so it can be interpreted as a probability weight corresponding to a particular field configuration.

The generating functional for fermionic observables is obtained by adding a fermionic source term $\mathfrak{J}\Psi$ to \mathcal{L} and integrating over Ψ . The result is

$$\mathcal{Z}[\mathfrak{J}] = \int \mathcal{D}\phi W[\phi] \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{J}^T \mathcal{A}^{-1} \mathfrak{J}\right). \quad (6)$$

The expectation value of a general fermion bilinear is generated by derivatives of $\mathcal{Z}[\mathfrak{J}]$ as follows:

$$\langle \Psi^T \mathcal{B} \Psi \rangle = \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{B} \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{Z}[\mathfrak{J}] \Big|_{\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow 0} = -\text{Tr} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

The interesting bilinears in this work are the fermion density n and the pairing condensate Σ , for which

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\sigma_2 S_+ \\ i\sigma_2 S_- & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where S_\pm denotes a temporal shift, $S_\pm \psi_x = \psi_{x \pm \hat{e}_4}$. In practice a number of random sources N_{src} are used to evaluate the trace. Let $\eta_i(x, \alpha)$ be a Gaussian-distributed random complex number at site x ; α labels the 4 internal Ψ indices, and i runs from 1 to N_{src} . Then $\text{Tr} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}^{-1} = \sum_i \eta_i^\dagger \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}^{-1} \eta_i / N_{\text{src}}$. The fermion density can also be computed through $n = m^2 \langle \phi \rangle = m^2 \int \mathcal{D}\phi \phi W[\phi]$; this provides a check of the code used to compute (7).

As stated earlier, this lattice field theory of a homogeneous, dilute gas of 2-component fermions starts from first principles, and uncertainties can be removed systematically. The thermodynamic limit is reached simply by increasing the volume of the system. The continuum limit is more nuanced. To remove the lattice spacing b_s while maintaining constant physics, one keeps $n^{1/3}a$ held fixed; then all physical length scales are related to $n^{-1/3}$. The continuum limit is the limit where $n^{-1/3} \gg b_s$, achieved by tuning lattice parameters so that $(b_s/a) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mu b_s^2/\xi \rightarrow 0$.

There are 3 physical quantities we wish to control: n , a , and T . We do so by tuning μ , m^2 , and the size of the lattice in imaginary time, varying either N_t or ξ . A calculation in effective field theory matches the scattering length to the lattice parameters m^2 and ξ , modulo finite volume and spacing corrections [12]:

$$\frac{m^2}{\xi} = -\frac{b_s}{4\pi a} + \int_{BZ} \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{|\hat{\mathbf{p}}|^2(1 + |\hat{\mathbf{p}}|^2/4\xi)}. \quad (9)$$

$\hat{p}_i = 2 \sin(p_i/2)$ and the BZ integration/summation is over available momenta in the Brillouin zone. The temperature is tuned by varying ξ

$$\frac{T}{n_0^{2/3}} = \frac{\xi}{N_t(n_0 b_s^3)^{2/3}} \quad (10)$$

where n_0 denotes the zero temperature density. One expects the chemical potential μ to strongly control n . However, the exact mapping of lattice parameters to physical quantities is not known *a priori* and must be determined via simulation before any precise physics results can be obtained. This paper is the first voyage into this parameter space.

The equivalence of the quantum statistical path integral (5) to a classical statistical partition function suggests that numerical methods for simulating spin systems like the Ising model can be used to study this dilute Fermi gas. Additionally we can draw from the expertise developed for lattice QCD. For any configuration of field values $C = \{\phi_x\}$, the contribution of any observable $Q[\phi]$ is weighted by the nonnegative factor $W[\phi]$. One uses importance sampling to generate an ensemble of 4 dimensional field configurations which give the greatest contributions to $\langle Q \rangle = \mathcal{Z}^{-1} \int \mathcal{D}\phi Q[\phi] W[\phi]$. Having obtained a sample of N configurations which are distributed according to $W[\phi]$, observables are estimated by their ensemble average $\bar{Q} = \sum_C Q[C]/N$.

In this work, the hybrid Monte Carlo (HMC) algorithm [16] is used to generate samples of scalar field configurations. One can think of the sequence of configurations as successive snapshots of scalar fields evolving in an artificial time τ , referred to as Monte Carlo (MC) time (distinct from Euclidean time x_4). Given some initial configuration $C_0 = C(\tau_0)$, a trial configuration $C'_0(\tau_0 + \Delta\tau)$ is obtained by evolving the 4D scalar fields forward in τ using classical equations of motion. The process $C_0 \rightarrow C'_0$ is called a *trajectory* and is done in discrete steps. The change in the HMC Hamiltonian $\Delta\mathcal{H}$ is computed, and the new configuration is accepted as C_1 with probability $\min(1, e^{\Delta\mathcal{H}})$. The effects of the fermions are included by rewriting the determinant as a path integral over a complex scalar field χ with action $\chi^*(|J|^2 + \bar{K}^\dagger \tilde{K})^{-1} \chi$. The χ field is held fixed during the classical evolution. At the end of a trajectory it is updated by a heatbath step: $\chi = iJ^* \eta_1 + \bar{K}^\dagger \eta_2$, where η_1, η_2 are Gaussian noise vectors.

In some regions of parameter space, it is possible that the attraction between fermions is so strong that the lattice is densely packed with a fermion at every site, even at $\mu = 0$ [12]. This lattice phase would be separated from the dilute, continuum-like phase by a first order transition, preventing extrapolation to zero lattice spacing. Happily, it is straightforward to check that $nb_s^3 \ll 1$ for $\mu = 0$ in the interesting region of (m^2, ξ) space, namely where $b_s/a = 0$ [17]. For example, on a lattice with $V = 6^3$ and $N_t = 12$, $nb_s^3 = 0.0073(6)$ when $\mu = 0$ at $m^2 = 0.1456, \xi = 1$ (corresponding to $1/a = 0$ in infinite volume). Due to finite volume effects $n > 0$. The lesson is that these lattice parameters correspond to simulation of a dilute continuum-like Fermi gas, not a densely packed lattice of fermions. Consequently, we can study thermodynamics at $\mu > 0$ confident that the continuum limit




FIG. 1: The fermion condensate Σ (left) and the density n in lattice units (right) as functions of external source for $m^2 = 0.175$. Different symbols indicate different values of ξ , corresponding to different temperatures. Points at $J > 0$ are simulation data, and those at $J = 0$ are the results of linear extrapolations (solid lines). Some data points are displaced horizontally for clarity.

can be reached in the manner described above.

The results presented below were obtained on a $V = 8^3$ lattice with $\mu b_t = 0.4$. With $N_t = 16$, m^2 was set to 1 of 4 values, and then 4-5 values of ξ were used to locate the phase transition. At each (m^2, ξ) pair, separate simulations were performed setting $J = 0.07, 0.1, \text{ and } 0.14$ in order to extrapolate to $J = 0$. Each simulation was run for 4000 HMC trajectories with 32, 25, and 20 steps per trajectory for respective values of J . Observables were computed (with $N_{\text{src}} = 10$) at 20 trajectory intervals for a total of 200 measurements per simulation. Dropping the first 50 measurements was sufficient to ensure the sample had equilibrated. To estimate correlations between successive measurements, the data were binned in groups of 2, 5, 10, and 20; $N_{\text{bin}} = 5$ sufficed to account for correlations. The statistical errors are certainly much smaller than the finite volume and lattice spacing uncertainties of this exploratory study, so we do not discuss them further.

Fig. 1 shows the $J \rightarrow 0$ extrapolation of Σ for $m^2 = 0.175$; the extrapolations for the other values of m^2 are similar. A more accurate extrapolation, exploiting an effective field theory analysis can be made once more data are obtained; however, in this work we emphasize the sharp decrease in $\Sigma|_{J \rightarrow 0}$. Corrections to linearity will not qualitatively change our exploratory conclusions about locating T_c .

In order to convert the observation of a phase transition at a critical ξ into a critical temperature using (10), we need the zero temperature fermion density n_0 . In this work we assume that $T_c/4$ is sufficiently low compared to T_c that we can compute n_0 with $N_t = 48$ (and $J = 0.14$). We find $n_0 b_s^3 = 0.2612(6)$ and $0.2893(7)$ for




FIG. 2: The fermion condensate Σ , after extrapolating $J \rightarrow 0$. As ξ increases, so does T , and the system goes from superfluid to normal. Lines connect the points merely to guide the eye.




FIG. 3: Critical temperature vs. inverse scattering length. The solid line shows T_c in the BCS regime and the bold broken line shows the T_c for BEC of di-fermion molecules. In the center is the present, *exploratory* result for T_c/T_F . The horizontal error bar reflects the sensitivity of a on ξ over the critical region.

$(m^2, \xi) = (0.155, 1.2)$ and $(0.175, 1.3)$, respectively. (The quoted uncertainties represent the statistical error only.) The densities at $T_c/4$ are close to those at T_c , e.g. the corresponding $nb_s^3 = 0.2577(12)$ and $0.2877(7)$.

Little dependence of n on N_t or J is apparent in the finite temperature data. Results for n with $N_t = 16$ and $m^2 = 0.175$ are shown in Fig. 1; plots for other values of m^2 are similar.

Using these low temperature densities in (10) leads to $T_c/T_F = 0.035 \pm 0.004$ and 0.036 ± 0.004 for $m^2 = 0.155$ and 0.175 . It turns out that b_s/a changes significantly as ξ is tuned through the transition region. With $m^2 = 0.155$, b_s/a goes from -0.10 at $\xi = 1.1$ to 0.10 at $\xi = 1.2$,

and with $m^2 = 0.175$, b_s/a varies from -0.11 at $\xi = 1.2$ to 0.08 at $\xi = 1.3$. In order to determine T_c precisely for fixed values of $1/a$, simulations should hold ξ fixed and vary μ across the transition. This work is in progress.

Fig. 3 compares the results of this work with calculations of T_c in the BCS [18] and BEC regimes. Since the different curves in Fig. 2 correspond to the phase transition at slightly different lattice spacings (i.e. slightly different $n_0 b_s$) but over the same large ranges of $1/(n_0^{1/3} a)$, only one data point is plotted. Reduction of lattice spacing and volume errors will allow T_c to be studied more precisely in the region $-1 < n_0^{1/3} a < 1$.

In conclusion, these initial results demonstrate both the advantages and the challenges of using lattice field theory to study fermion pairing at strong coupling. The critical temperature is straightforward to find; we showed the condensate vanishing across the finite T transition for 4 paths through parameter space. The scattering length varies quickly along those paths, so different directions in parameter space must be used to compute T_c while holding a fixed. The effects of lattice volume and spacing need to be studying systematically and will require significant computational resources. This exploratory work represents the first leg of the journey to obtain a first principles calculation of T_c in the universal regime.

This work was supported by DOE grant DE-FG02-00ER41132. Simulations were performed on the LQCD clusters at Fermilab and Jefferson Lab. Conversations with A. Bulgac, J.-W. Chen, H.-W. Hammer, D.B. Kaplan, and D.T. Son are gratefully acknowledged.

-
- [1] K. M. O'Hara et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4204 (1999).
 - [2] B. DeMarco and D. Jin, Science **285**, 1703 (1999).
 - [3] A. J. Leggett, in *Modern Trends in the Theory of Condensed Matter*, edited by A. Pekalski and R. Przystawa (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980).
 - [4] M. Holland et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 120406 (2001).
 - [5] K. M. O'Hara et al., Science **298**, 2179 (2002).
 - [6] M. E. Gehm et al., Phys. Rev. A **68**, 011401(R) (2003).
 - [7] T. Bourdel et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 020402 (2003).
 - [8] C. Chin et al., Science **305**, 1128 (2004).
 - [9] J. Carlson et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 050401 (2003).
 - [10] S. Y. Chang et al., Phys. Rev. A **70**, 043602 (2004).
 - [11] G. E. Astrakharchik et al. (2004), cond-mat/0406113.
 - [12] J.-W. Chen and D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 257002 (2004).
 - [13] I. Montvay and G. Münster, *Quantum Fields on a Lattice* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
 - [14] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage, and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B534**, 329 (1998).
 - [15] E. Braaten and H.-W. Hammer (2004), cond-mat/0410417.
 - [16] S. Duane et al., Phys. Lett. **B195**, 216 (1987).
 - [17] M. Wingate (2004), hep-lat/0409060.
 - [18] H. Heiselberg, C. J. Pethick, H. Smith, and L. Viverit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2418 (2000).