

Pairing states of a polarized Fermi gas trapped in a one-dimensional optical lattice

A. E. Feiguin¹ and F. Heidrich-Meisner²

¹Microsoft Station Q, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106

²Materials Science and Technology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 37831, and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA

(Dated: October 30, 2018)

We study the properties of a one-dimensional (1D) gas of fermions trapped in a lattice by means of the density matrix renormalization group method, focusing on the case of unequal spin populations, and strong attractive interaction. In the low density regime, the system phase-separates into a well defined superconducting core and a fully polarized metallic cloud surrounding it. We argue that the superconducting phase corresponds to a 1D analog of the Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov (FFLO) state, with a quasi-condensate of tightly bound bosonic pairs with a finite center-of-mass momentum that scales linearly with the magnetization. In the large density limit, the system allows for four phases: in the core, we either find a Fock state of localized pairs or a metallic shell with free spin-down fermions moving in a fully filled background of spin-up fermions. As the magnetization increases, the Fock state disappears to give room for a metallic phase, with a partially polarized superconducting FFLO shell and a fully polarized metallic cloud surrounding the core.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Ss, 03.75.Mn, 03.75.Hh, 71.10.Pm, 71.10.Fd

Ultracold atoms in optical lattices can be used to study models of strongly correlated fermions in clean and controlled experimental conditions. In particular, cold gases provide an optimal playground to study the crossover between a Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) superfluid, with extended Cooper pairs, and a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC), composed of molecules of tightly bound pairs.¹ As cold atom gases can also be realized in optical lattices, dimensional crossover effects can be accessed.² In particular, 1D optical lattices can be prepared by strongly ramping up the amplitudes of two out of three counterpropagating light waves.² This, combined with the possibility of tuning the interactions, allows for the realization of the fermionic 1D Hubbard model, with, in experiments, two hyperfine states interacting via an onsite potential.³ In the case of a spin imbalanced fermion mixture, magnetized superconducting states are expected, such as, e.g., a superfluid-normal mixture⁴ or the one predicted by Fulde and Ferrell⁵ and Larkin and Ovchinnikov⁶ (FFLO state) over four decades ago. The FFLO state⁷ is characterized by pairing across a spin-split Fermi surface, with the resulting Cooper pairs having a finite center-of-mass momentum, proportional to the spin polarization, and consequently, an oscillatory phase in the superconducting correlation function. Its experimental observation has eluded condensed matter physicist until very recently, when it was detected in heavy-fermion systems.⁸ Its realization in cold atom systems has acquired particular relevance for the field of high- T_c superconductivity. Moreo and Scalapino⁹ have recently pointed out that, by exploiting a particle-hole transformation,¹⁰ its presence in the 2D attractive Hubbard model may imply the existence of a striped phase in its repulsive counterpart.

Experiments on 3D traps^{11,12} suggest the existence of phase-separated shells, with a superfluid core, and a partially polarized normal cloud, and a future characterization of the superconducting phases may establish whether the FFLO phase is present or not. Theoretical work indicates that the FFLO phase is stable in a narrow window around the (unpo-

larized) Fermi surface.⁷ However, the instability against an FFLO state may be enhanced in low dimensions, rendering this state more robust.

The uniform 1D polarized Fermi gas has been studied by means of bosonization and renormalization group techniques,¹³ providing evidence for the existence of an FFLO state. The case of fermions confined to a 1D trap has been analyzed using modified versions of the Gaudin-Yang Hamiltonian,^{14,15} a minimal integrable model of fermions in the continuum interacting via a contact potential. A two-shell structure has been predicted,^{16,17} with a partially polarized phase of the FFLO type in the center of the trap, and either fully paired or fully polarized wings, depending on the strength of the magnetic field or, equivalently, the total magnetization.

In this work we investigate the FFLO state in a Hubbard chain, thus accounting for the optical lattice:

$$H = -t \sum_{i=1, \sigma}^{L-1} (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i+1\sigma} + h.c.) + U \sum_{i=1}^L n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} + V \sum_{i=1}^L (x - L/2)^2 n_i, \quad (1)$$

where $c_{l\sigma}^\dagger$ creates a fermion with spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ at site l , $n_{l\sigma} = c_{l\sigma}^\dagger c_{l\sigma}$, $n_l = n_{l\uparrow} + n_{l\downarrow}$ is the local density, t is the hopping parameter, and U is the onsite interaction energy, which in this work is negative. We define $x = ia$, where a is the lattice spacing, set to unity. We add a harmonic confining potential parameterized by a constant V . The Hubbard model with $V = 0$ has been extensively studied, and its properties are well documented in the literature.¹⁸ The low-energy properties of the Hamiltonian (1) with $U < 0$ are those of a Luther-Emery liquid.¹⁹ At small attractive interactions, fermions form Cooper-pair-like bound states with a spin gap, reminiscent of the superconducting gap in conventional BSC superconductors. In the case of strong interactions, the




FIG. 1: (color online) Results for the 1D attractive Hubbard model ($U = -8t, L = 80$), with $N = 40$ fermions confined by a parabolic potential with strength $V = 0.002t$, for different magnetizations: (a) Density profile, (b) magnetization profile, (c) charge fluctuations, and (d) spin fluctuations.

pairs become tightly bound with their extension of the order of the lattice spacing only, effectively behaving as hard-core bosons, while the spin degree of freedom moves to high energies. Superconducting correlations then decay algebraically. The parabolic trap adds an extra ingredient that leads to the emergence of non-uniform states, and the inclusion of a lattice may produce a richer phase diagram. It has been shown, for instance, that this allows for the possibility of engineering states of hard-core bosons such as pure Fock states that cannot be found in the continuum.²⁰ At the same time, the physics of the system without a lattice can be recovered in the low density limit. While recent studies have addressed the *unpolarized* situation²¹, this article's chief case is the *polarized* one. Note that the corresponding situation with repulsive interactions has been studied in, e.g., Ref. 22.

We use the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) method²³ to obtain the ground state properties of this model in finite systems, for different numbers of particles $N = N_\uparrow + N_\downarrow$, and values of the total magnetization $S^z = (N_\uparrow - N_\downarrow)/2$. In our calculations we choose $L = 80, U = -8t$, and $V = 0.002t$, unless otherwise stated. In the following we describe two typical situations in the low and large density regimes, which illustrate the main features of the problem.

We start by looking at the low density case with $N = 40$ particles. In Fig.1 we show the local density $\langle n_i \rangle$ and the spin projection $\langle S_i^z \rangle$ along with the fluctuations of both quantities. We define the charge fluctuations as $\langle (\delta n_i)^2 \rangle = \langle n_i^2 \rangle - \langle n_i \rangle^2$, and similar for the spin fluctuations $\langle (\delta S_i^z)^2 \rangle$.

The system exhibits a nearly half-filled density profile in the center with a sharp edge, and oscillations accompanied by large fluctuations. As the magnetization grows, the core of the system becomes partially polarized, displaying charge and spin oscillations, surrounded by fully polarized clouds with spin \uparrow -fermions only. We can clearly identify two well defined phases: the fully polarized metallic wings, surrounding a polarized state in the core that we wish to characterize in more detail in the following.




FIG. 2: (color online) (a) Pair momentum distribution function for $N = 40$ fermions with $N^{\text{pair}} = \sum_k n_k^{\text{pair}}$. The dotted lines show results for the sum in Eq. (2) restricted to the center of the trap. (b) Spatial decay of pair correlations (squares). Dashed line: Fit to $n_{lm}^{\text{pair}} \propto \cos(k|l-m|)/|l-m|^\alpha$ (compare Ref. 13). Data shown for $L = 100, N = 80, V = 0.0005t, S^z = 8$, corresponding to the same effective density $\rho_{\text{eff}} = N\sqrt{V}$. (c) Momentum k_{max} , at which the distribution shown in (a) is peaked, vs. magnetization of the core $S_{\text{eff}}^z / L_{\text{eff}}$ ($L_{\text{eff}} \approx 40$, see text).

For this purpose, it is illustrating to analyze the natural pair excitations of the system in terms of a bosonic description with creation and annihilation operators $b_i^\dagger = c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger$ and $b_i = c_{i\downarrow} c_{i\uparrow}$. In the low-density limit, indeed, the pairs behave in good approximation like bosons since $[b_i^\dagger, b_i] = 1 - 2n_i \approx 1$, but we will use it generically, as it provides an intuitive picture. We further define the pair one-particle density matrix (OPDM) as $\rho_{ij} = \langle b_i^\dagger b_j \rangle$.

In Fig. 2, we show the pair momentum distribution function (MDF)

$$n_k^{\text{pair}} = (1/L) \sum_{lm} \exp[ik(l-m)] \rho_{lm}. \quad (2)$$

In the unpolarized case, we see a sharp peak centered at momentum $k = 0$, as observed for quasi-condensates of hard-core bosons.²⁰ As the magnetization increases, the distribution exhibits two maxima, centered at momenta $\pm k_{\text{max}}$. Note that by restricting the summation over l, m to the core part of the systems, the features in n_k^{pair} become more prominent (dotted lines in Fig.2). From Fig. 2 (c), we see that momentum k_{max} is proportional to the magnetization in the core S_{eff}^z , that is obtained by integrating $\langle S_i^z \rangle$ over the effective size of the region occupied by the FFLO state, from Fig.1 (a). Our results reproduce precisely the behavior expected for the FFLO state, in which the pairs possess a finite center-of-mass momentum $k = k_{F\uparrow} - k_{F\downarrow}$ (where $k_{F\sigma}$ is the Fermi vector of the spin- σ fermions), which is predicted to grow as $k = \pi(n_\uparrow - n_\downarrow)/L = 2\pi S^z/L$.⁷ In Fig.2 (b) we show the spatial decay of the pair correlations, consistent with a power-law decay of the form $n_{lm}^{\text{pair}} \propto \cos(k_{\text{max}}|l-m|)/|l-m|^\alpha$, as predicted in Ref. 13.

The bosonic quasi-condensate can be studied by means of Penrose and Onsager's description of the superfluid order parameter.²⁴ The natural orbitals (NO) ψ_α of the system




FIG. 3: (color online) Natural orbital ψ_0 of the pair OPDM for $N = 40$ confined fermions and different magnetizations. The inset shows the OPDM's eigenvalues λ_α .

will simply be the single particle eigenstates – in the bosonic sense – of the pair OPDM, and the corresponding eigenvalues λ_α represent their occupations. The NO with the largest eigenvalue, ψ_0 , is the single-particle state in which quasi-condensation takes place. The lowest NO and the eigenvalues of the OPDM are presented in the main panel and the inset of Fig. 3, respectively. The distribution of eigenvalues qualitatively resembles the results for a trapped gas of hard-core bosons.²⁰ In the unpolarized case we observe a macroscopic occupation of the lowest eigenstate, corresponding to the order parameter. The effect of increasing the magnetization is to decrease the occupation of the bosonic condensate, rendering the profile of λ_α vs α less pronounced. The lowest NO, representing the bosonic order parameter, resembles the density profile in the unpolarized case, see Fig. 1(a). As the magnetization increases, it develops sharp oscillations, in agreement with the results for the MDF. As observed in Ref. 9, we see that the unpaired fermions accumulate in the nodes of the order parameter, effectively forming magnetic domain walls. The single-particle wave function is well confined to the core of the system, an indication of the phase separation between the FFLO state in the center and the fully polarized metallic wings. This observation, i.e., the confinement of the NO to a window of length $L_{\text{eff}} \approx L/2$ further corroborates the use of the effective quantities L_{eff} and S_{eff}^z in the inset of Fig. 2(b).

We now turn our focus to the dense limit, by looking at a system with $N = 80$ particles. The results for the local density and magnetization are shown in Fig. 4, along with their fluctuations. In the unpolarized case $S^z = 0$, a plateau at density $\langle n_i \rangle = 2$ appears in the center, surrounded by an extended region with oscillations around $\langle n_i \rangle = 1$. The state in the center is a pure Fock state of localized pairs, without coherence, and decoupled from the rest of the system. As a consequence, the charge and spin fluctuations in the center of the trap are totally suppressed, which are signatures of a band insulator with localized bound pairs, and both finite charge and spin gaps. The fluctuations increase abruptly at the boundary with the partially-filled, unpolarized region. As the total magnetization increases, pairs are broken and the polarized fermions move toward the edges, effectively suppressing the gaps and




FIG. 4: (color online) Same parameters as in Fig.1, but $N = 80$ fermions. (a) Density profile, (b) magnetization profile, (c) charge fluctuations, and (d) spin fluctuations.

the band insulating behavior in the center of the trap. The Fock state survives small values of S^z but disappears rapidly, and the local magnetization becomes almost uniform, roughly equal to the average total magnetization, $\langle S_i^z \rangle \approx S^z/N$. The fluctuations are most prominent in the intermediate region between the wings and the core, and after reaching a maximum there, they decrease again to values similar to those observed in the center.

More details are revealed in Figs. 5(a) and (b), where we plot the densities $\langle n_{i\sigma} \rangle$ for $S^z = 2$ and 8, respectively. Obviously, the wings are fully polarized, and the \uparrow -spins fill the core of the trap with a plateau of density $\langle n_{i\uparrow} \rangle = 1$. The Fock state survives at $S^z = 2$ and we find a distribution $\langle n_{i\downarrow} \rangle$ that resembles the one of trapped spinless fermions.²⁰ Fig. 5(c) shows the MDF calculated in shells centered in the middle of the trap, by restricting the sum in Eq. (2). As we cross the different phases surrounding the core, the distribution evolves from the bulk result with two peaks to a featureless uniform profile describing localized pairs. This shows that in the central region, only the \downarrow -fermions exhibit any dynamics.

These results establish the existence of three distinct phases: first, there is a metallic, fully polarized phase at the wings, behaving like a partially-filled band of spinless fermions and second, a partially polarized phase in the center that is a metal of freely moving \downarrow -fermions in a uniform background of \uparrow -fermions, with an effective site energy of $-U$. An intermediate, third shell separates the two, with features that resemble those observed in the FFLO state in the low density regime. Notice that a fourth phase, the Fock state in the center, survives at small values of the magnetization, before giving way to the metallic core.

In order to shed light on the nature of this intermediate phase, we analyze the pair OPDM's spectrum and NOs. In Fig. 5(d), we plot the first three NOs that do not correspond to localized bound states. These NOs are precisely situated in the region where the intermediate phase is found. We have also calculated the MDF by restricting the summation in Eq. (2) to only this region of the lattice (and the reflected sector on the opposite side). This restricted MDF exhibits finite center-of-




FIG. 5: (color online) (a),(b) Particle density for $\langle n_{i\sigma} \rangle$, $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$, for $N = 80$ fermions, and $S^z = 2, 8$, respectively. The double occupancy $\langle d_i \rangle = \langle n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} \rangle$ is also included. (c) Pair momentum distribution function measured in concentric shells of different radii, for $S^z = 8$. (d) First three NOs of the pair OPDM that are not just localized states. The inset shows the eigenvalues of the pair OPDM.

mass momenta that coincide with those observed in Fig. 5(c) in the full n_k^{pair} , evidencing the FFLO phase.

Our results in the dilute limit are in general agreement with Refs. 16,17. However, we have not found evidence for a fully paired state in the wings. According to the analysis of Ref. 16, 17, this phase should be stable if the magnetic field is smaller than half the binding energy of the bosonic pairs. This should occur below a critical polarization of $P = 2S^z/N = 0.2$ in the strong coupling limit. In our calculations, for all values

of density and magnetization considered (not shown here), we have only seen a fully polarized phase surrounding the core.

In conclusion, we have numerically studied the attractive Hubbard model in a parabolic trapping potential, in different density and magnetization regimes. In the unpolarized limit, the system tends to be superconducting, but when the density increases, an insulating Fock state of localized pairs forms in the center of the trap, displacing the superconducting state toward the boundaries. When the spin population is imbalanced, two different limits are realized: At low densities we have found a structure with two regions, a well defined superconducting inner core, and fully polarized metallic wings that effectively behave as a 1D gas of non-interacting spinless fermions. As the density increases, four phases emerge as a function of S^z : a Fock state in the center of the trap is gradually replaced by free \downarrow -fermions moving in a fully filled \uparrow background. A superconducting shell separates it from the fully polarized wings. At finite magnetizations, the superconducting state becomes partially polarized, and can be described as a FFLO state with an oscillating order parameter and tightly bound pairs with a finite center-of-mass momentum. In the mean-field theory, the FFLO phase is regarded to be stable in a very narrow window around the Fermi surface,⁷ but we find that the presence of the trap helps to stabilize it by phase-separating the system.

We thank A. Moreo, D.J. Scalapino, and M. Troyer for helpful discussions, and S. Trebst for a critical reading of the manuscript. We are grateful to the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics at UCSB, where the idea for this work was conceived, and The Aspen Center for Physics for their hospitality. F.H.-M.'s work is supported in part by NSF grant DMR-0706020, and by contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 with UT-Battelle, LLC.

¹ See, e.g., I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, arXiv:0704.3011 and references therein.
² T. Stöferle, H. Moritz, C. Schori, M. Köhl, and T. Esslinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 130403 (2004).
³ H. Moritz, T. Stöferle, K. Günter, M. Köhl, and T. Esslinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 210401 (2005).
⁴ P.F. Bedaque, H. Caldas, and G. Rupak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 247002 (2003).
⁵ P. Fulde and A. Ferrell, Phys. Rev. **135**, A550 (1964).
⁶ A. Larkin and Y.N. Ovchinnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 1136 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 762 (1965)].
⁷ For a review, see: D.E. Sheehy and L. Radzihovsky, Annals of Physics **322**, 1790 (2007), and references therein.
⁸ H.A. Radovan, A. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, C. Capan, P.G. Pagliuso, and J.L. Sarrao, Nature **425**, 51 (2003). See also A. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, C. Capan, P.G. Pagliuso, and J.L. Sarrao Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 187004 (2003).
⁹ A. Moreo and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 216402 (2007).
¹⁰ V.J. Emery, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 2989 (1976).
¹¹ M.W. Zwierlein, A. Schirotzek, C.H. Schunck, W. Ketterle, Science **311**, 492 (2006); M.W. Zwierlein, C.H. Schunck, A. Schirotzek, W. Ketterle, Nature **442**, 54 (2006); Y. Shin, M. W. Zwierlein, C. H. Schunck, A. Schirotzek, and W. Ketterle, Phys. Rev.

Let. **97**, 030401(2006).
¹² G.B. Partridge, W. Li, R.I. Kamar, Y.A. Liao, R.G. Hulet, Science **311**, 503 (2006); G.B. Partridge, W. Li, Y.A. Liao, R.G. Hulet, M. Haque and H. T. C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 190407 (2006).
¹³ K. Yang, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 140511(R) (2001).
¹⁴ M. Gaudin, Phys. Lett. A **24A**, 55 (1967).
¹⁵ C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1312 (1967).
¹⁶ G. Orso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 070402 (2007).
¹⁷ H. Hu, Xia-Ji Liu, and P. D. Drummond, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 070403 (2007). See also X.W. Guan, M.T. Batchelor, C. Lee, and M. Bortz, Phys. Rev. B **76** 085120 (2007).
¹⁸ See, for instance: F. Essler *et al.*, "The One-Dimensional Hubbard Model", Cambridge University Press (2005).
¹⁹ A. Luther and V.J. Emery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 589 (1974).
²⁰ M. Rigol and A. Muramatsu, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 031603(R) (2004); *ibid* **72**, 013604 (2005).
²¹ F. Karim Pour, M. Rigol, S. Wessel, and A. Muramatsu, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 161104(R) (2007); G. Xianlong, M. Rizzi, M. Polini, R. Fazio, M.P. Tosi, V.L. Campo, Jr., and K. Capelle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 030404 (2007); R.A. Molina, J. Dukelsky, and P. Schmitteckert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 080404 (2007); C. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** 120406 (2004).
²² C. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 120406 (2004).

²³ S.R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992); Phys. Rev. B **48**, 10345 (1993); U. Schollwöck, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 259 (2005).

²⁴ O. Penrose and L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **104**, 576 (1956). See also

A.J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 307 (2001).