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A few introductory clarifications:

✓ LDA is understood here as the Kohn-Sham extension of the Hohenberg-Kohn extension of the Energy Density Functional (EDF).

✓ We shall not discuss here the existence and/or the uniqueness of the LDA (EDF) to systems with pairing correlations.

✓ However, we shall discuss the feasibility, the implementation, how LDA for systems with pairing correlations works and the accuracy of this approach.

✓ Since the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov approximation is not accurate for the description of the pairing correlations (explicit examples will be given during the presentation) in either the weak or strong coupling limits, one is left with no option but to use an EDF or some other approach (still to be formulated, but it is really unclear what else could be feasible).
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Superconductivity and superfluidity in Fermi systems

- Dilute atomic Fermi gases \( T_c > 10^{-12} \text{ eV} \)
- Liquid \(^3\text{He}\) \( T_c > 10^{-7} \text{ eV} \)
- Metals, composite materials \( T_c > 10^{-3} - 10^{-2} \text{ eV} \)
- Nuclei, neutron stars \( T_c > 10^5 - 10^6 \text{ eV} \)
- QCD color superconductivity \( T_c > 10^7 - 10^8 \text{ eV} \)

Units (1 eV > 10^4K)
Why is the nuclear pairing problem still an open problem?

- We do not know yet whether pairing has a volume or/and surface character.
- The isospin properties of the pairing field are largely unknown (more about this later).
- Coupling of the pairing field to vibrations is a field still in its infancy. Even though nuclear pairing coupling occurs in the so-called weak coupling limit, screening effects are large and effects beyond mean-field (HFB) are substantial.
- Pairing is a key feature of neutron stars and we understand this part still rather badly: proton and neutron pairing in $s$ and $p$ partial waves, properties of vortices, mixed phases, etc.
- Prediction of nucleon drip lines and basic nuclear properties for exotic nuclei - RIA physics and astrophysics (nucleo-synthesis).
Density Functional Theory (DFT)  
Hohenberg and Kohn, 1964

\[ E_{gs} = \int d^3 r \varepsilon [\rho(\vec{r})] \]

Local Density Approximation (LDA)  
Kohn and Sham, 1965

\[ E_{gs} = \int d^3 r \varepsilon [\rho(\vec{r}), \tau(\vec{r})] \]

\[ \rho(\vec{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} |v_i(\vec{r})|^2 \]

\[ \tau(\vec{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\vec{\nabla} v_i(\vec{r})|^2 \]

Normal Fermi systems only!
Assume that there are two different many-body wave functions, corresponding to the same number particle density!

\[
\Psi_A(\vec{r}_1, \ldots, \vec{r}_N) \Rightarrow \rho(\vec{r})
\]

\[
\Psi_B(\vec{r}_1, \ldots, \vec{r}_N) \Rightarrow \rho(\vec{r})
\]

\[
\Psi_A(\vec{r}_1, \ldots, \vec{r}_N) \neq \Psi_B(\vec{r}_1, \ldots, \vec{r}_N)
\]

\[
H = \sum_i T_i + \sum_{i<j} V_{ij} + \sum_{i<j<k} V_{ijk} + \ldots
\]

\[
E_A = \left\langle \Psi_A \left| H + \sum_i V_i \right| \Psi_A \right\rangle = \left\langle \Psi_A \left| H \right| \Psi_A \right\rangle + \text{Tr}(V\rho)
\]

\[
E_B = \left\langle \Psi_B \left| H + \sum_i U_i \right| \Psi_B \right\rangle = \left\langle \Psi_B \left| H \right| \Psi_B \right\rangle + \text{Tr}(U\rho)
\]

\[
E_A < \left\langle \Psi_B \left| H \right| \Psi_B \right\rangle + \text{Tr}(V\rho)
\]

\[
E_B < \left\langle \Psi_A \left| H \right| \Psi_A \right\rangle + \text{Tr}(U\rho)
\]

\[
E_A + E_B < E_A + E_B
\]

Nonsense!
After retaining only the pole (bound state) contribution in the 2-particle channel

A new field, the pairing field, is appearing, which mixes particle and hole states.

Following Migdal and using a half-century old language: Feynman diagrams (sum over histories)

Improve the particle propagator beyond the usual mean-field
Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov approximation

\[ \alpha_k | gs \rangle = 0 \]

\[ \begin{cases} \alpha_k = \int dx [u^*_k(x) \psi(x) + v_k(x) \psi^+(x)] \\ \alpha^+_k = \int dx [v^*_k(x) \psi(x) + u_k(x) \psi^+(x)] \end{cases} \]

\[ E_{gs} - \lambda \mathcal{N} = \langle gs | \hat{H} - \lambda \hat{N} | gs \rangle \]

\[ \rho(x, y) = \sum_{E_k > 0} v_k(x)v^*_k(y) \]

\[ \nu(x, y) = \sum_{E_k > 0} u_k(x)v^*_k(y) \]

\[ \begin{pmatrix} h - \lambda & \Delta \\ \Delta^+ & -(h^* - \lambda) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_k \\ v_k \end{pmatrix} = E_k \begin{pmatrix} u_k \\ v_k \end{pmatrix} \]
LDA for superfluid fermi systems
(Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations)

\[ E_{gs} = \int d^3 r \varepsilon(\rho(\vec{r}), \tau(\vec{r}), \nu(\vec{r})) \]
\[ \rho(\vec{r}) = 2 \sum_k |v_k(\vec{r})|^2, \quad \tau(\vec{r}) = 2 \sum_k |\vec{V}v_k(\vec{r})|^2 \]
\[ \nu(\vec{r}) = \sum_k u_k(\vec{r})v_k^*(\vec{r}) \]
\[ \begin{pmatrix} T + U(\vec{r}) - \lambda & \Delta(\vec{r}) \\ \Delta^*(\vec{r}) & -(T + U(\vec{r}) - \lambda) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_k(\vec{r}) \\ v_k(\vec{r}) \end{pmatrix} = E_k \begin{pmatrix} u_k(\vec{r}) \\ v_k(\vec{r}) \end{pmatrix} \]

Mean-field and pairing field are both local fields!
(for sake of simplicity spin degrees of freedom are not shown)

There is a little problem! The pairing field \( \Delta \) diverges.
Nature of the problem

\[ \nu(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) = \sum_{E_k > 0} v_k^*(\vec{r}_1) u_k(\vec{r}_2) \propto \frac{1}{|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|} \]

\[ \Delta(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) = \frac{1}{2} V(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) \nu(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) \]

It is easier to show how this singularity appears in infinite homogeneous matter (BCS model)

\[ v_k(\vec{r}) = v_k \exp(i k \cdot \vec{r}), \quad u_k(\vec{r}) = u_k \exp(i k \cdot \vec{r}) \]

\[ v_k^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_k - \lambda}{\sqrt{(\varepsilon_k - \lambda)^2 + \Delta^2}} \right), \quad u_k^2 + v_k^2 = 1, \quad \varepsilon_k = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + U, \quad \Delta = \frac{\hbar^2 \delta}{2m} \]

\[ \nu(r) = \frac{\Delta m}{2\pi^2 \hbar^2} \int_0^\infty dk \frac{\sin(kr)}{kr} \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{(k^2 - k_F^2)^2 + \delta^2}} \]
A (too) simple case

\[ k_F \to 0, \delta \to 0 \]

\[ \nu(\mid \vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2 \mid) \to \frac{\Delta m}{2\pi^2 \hbar^2} \int_0^\infty dk \frac{\sin kr}{kr} = \frac{\Delta m}{2\pi^2 \hbar^2} \frac{\pi}{2\mid \vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2 \mid} \]

The integral converges (conditionally) at \( k > 1/r \) (iff \( r > 0 \))

The divergence is due to high momenta and thus its nature is independent of whether the system is finite or infinite.
If one introduces an explicit momentum cut-off one has to deal with this integral iff $r > 0$.

If $r = 0$ then the integral is simply:

$$h(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^x dy \frac{\sin y}{y}$$

In the final analysis all is an issue of the order of taking various limits: $r \to 0$ versus cut-off $x \to \infty$. 
Solution of the problem in the case of the homogeneous matter
(Lee, Huang and Yang and others)

Gap equation

\[ V(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2) = g \delta(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2) \]

Lippmann-Schwinger equation
(zero energy collision)

\[ T = V + VGT \]

Now combine the two equations and the divergence is (magically) removed!

\[ \frac{m}{4\pi\hbar^2 a} = -\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\varepsilon_k - \lambda)^2 + \Delta^2}} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} \right\} \]
How people deal with this problem in finite systems?

- Introduce an explicit energy cut-off, which can vary from 5 MeV to 100 MeV (sometimes significantly higher) from the Fermi energy.
- Use a particle-particle interaction with a finite range, the most popular one being Gogny’s interaction.

Both approaches are in the final analysis equivalent in principle, as a potential with a finite range $r_0$ provides a (smooth) cut-off at an energy $E_c = \hbar^2/mr_0^2$.

- The argument that nuclear forces have a finite range is superfluous, because nuclear pairing is manifest at small energies and distances of the order of the coherence length, which is much smaller than nuclear radii.
- Moreover, LDA works pretty well for the regular mean-field.
- A similar argument fails as well in case of electrons, where the radius of the interaction is infinite and LDA is fine.
Why would one consider a local pairing field?

✓ Because it makes sense physically!
✓ The treatment is so much simpler!
✓ Our intuition is so much better also.

\[ r_0 \approx \frac{\hbar}{p_F} = k_F^{-1} \]

radius of interaction  interparticle separation

\[ \Delta = \omega_D \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|V|N}\right) \ll \epsilon_F \]

coherence length  size of the Cooper pair

\[ \xi \approx \frac{1}{k_F} \frac{\epsilon_F}{\Delta} \gg r_0 \]
Pseudo-potential approach
(appropriate for very slow particles, very transparent but somewhat difficult to improve)

Lenz (1927), Fermi (1931), Blatt and Weiskopf (1952)
Lee, Huang and Yang (1957)

\[-\frac{\hbar^2 \Delta \vec{r}}{m} \psi (\vec{r}) + V (\vec{r}) \psi (\vec{r}) = E \psi (\vec{r}), \quad V (\vec{r}) \approx 0 \text{ if } r > R\]

\[\psi (\vec{r}) = \exp(ik \cdot \vec{r}) + \frac{f}{r} \exp(ikr) \approx 1 + \frac{f}{r} + \ldots \approx 1 - \frac{a}{r} + O(kr)\]

\[f^{-1} = -\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{2} r_0 k^2 - ik, \quad g = \frac{4\pi \hbar^2 a}{m(1 + ika)} + \ldots\]

if \(kr_0 \ll 1\) then \(V (\vec{r}) \psi (\vec{r}) \Rightarrow g \delta (\vec{r}) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[ r \psi (\vec{r}) \right]\)

Example : \(\psi (\vec{r}) = \frac{A}{r} + B + \ldots \Rightarrow \delta (\vec{r}) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[ r \psi (\vec{r}) \right] = \delta (\vec{r}) B\)
How to deal with an inhomogeneous/finite system?

\[ v_{\text{reg}}(\vec{r}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i \left[ v_i^*(\vec{r}) u_i(\vec{r}) + \frac{\Delta(\vec{r}) \psi_i^*(\vec{r}) \psi_i(\vec{r})}{2(\lambda - \epsilon_i)} \right] - \frac{\Delta(\vec{r})}{2} G_{\text{reg}}(\lambda, \vec{r}) \]

\[ G_{\text{reg}}(\lambda, \vec{r}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\vec{r}' \to \vec{r}} \left[ G(\vec{r}, \vec{r}', \lambda) + \frac{m}{2\pi\hbar^2 |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} \right] \]

\[ [h(\vec{r}) - \epsilon_i] \psi_i(\vec{r}) = 0 \]

\[ [\lambda - h(\vec{r})] G(\vec{r}, \vec{r}', \lambda) = \delta(\vec{r} - \vec{r}') \]

There is complete freedom in choosing the Hamiltonian \( h \) and we are going to take advantage of this!
We shall use a “Thomas-Fermi” approximation for the propagator $G$.

$$G(\vec{r}, \vec{r}', \lambda) = -\frac{m \exp(ik_F(\vec{r})|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)}{2\pi\hbar^2|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|}$$

$$\approx -\frac{m}{2\pi\hbar^2|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} - \frac{ik_F(\vec{r})m}{2\pi\hbar^2} + O(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)$$

$$\frac{\hbar^2 k_F^2(\vec{r})}{2m} + U(\vec{r}) = \lambda, \quad \frac{\hbar^2 k_c^2(\vec{r})}{2m} + U(\vec{r}) = \lambda + E_c$$

$$v_{\text{reg}}(\vec{r}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \sum_{E_i \leq E_c} v_i^*(\vec{r}) u_i(\vec{r}) + \frac{\Delta(\vec{r})}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{k_c(\vec{r})} \frac{1}{\lambda - \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - U(\vec{r}) + i\gamma} k^2 dk \right\} + \frac{i\Delta(\vec{r}) k_F(\vec{r})m}{4\pi\hbar^2}$$

Regularized anomalous density

Regular part of $G$
The renormalized equations:

\[ E_{gs} = \int d^3r [\mathcal{E}_N(r) + \mathcal{E}_S(r)], \]

\[ \mathcal{E}_S(r) := -\Delta(r)\nu_c(r) = g_{eff}(r)|\nu_c(r)|^2, \]

\[ \begin{cases} [h(r) - \mu]u_i(r) + \Delta(r)v_i(r) = E_iu_i(r), \\ \Delta^*(r)u_i(r) - [h(r) - \mu]v_i(r) = E_iv_i(r), \end{cases} \]

\[ h(r) = -\nabla \frac{\hbar^2}{2m(r)} \nabla + U(r), \quad \Delta(r) := -g_{eff}(r)\nu_c(r), \]

\[ \frac{1}{g_{eff}(r)} = \frac{1}{g(r)} - \frac{mk_c(r)}{2\pi^2\hbar^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{k_F(r)}{2k_c(r)} \ln \frac{k_c(r) + k_F(r)}{k_c(r) - k_F(r)} \right] \]

\[ \rho_c(r) = \sum_{E_i \geq 0} \frac{E_c}{2} |v_i(r)|^2, \quad \nu_c(r) = \sum_{E_i \geq 0} \frac{E_c}{2} v_i^*(r)u_i(r), \]

\[ E_c + \mu = \frac{\hbar^2k_c^2(r)}{2m(r)} + U(r), \quad \mu = \frac{\hbar^2k_F^2(r)}{2m(r)} + U(r). \]

**Typo:** replace m by m(r)
FIG. 1. The neutron pairing field $\Delta(r)$ as a function of the radial coordinate and of the cut-off energy $E_c$. Upward various curves correspond to $E_c = 20, 30, 35, 40, 45$ and 50 MeV respectively. On the scale of the figure the last two curves are indistinguishable.

FIG. 2. The gap $\Delta$ and the effective coupling constant $g_{\text{eff}}$ as a function of the cut-off energy $E_c$ for three regularization schemes. The full lines correspond to calculations using Eqs. (15 –17). Circles correspond to the regularization scheme presented in Ref. [5] (when only terms with $k_c$ are present). The pentagrams correspond to the vacuum regularization scheme [16]. The calculation was performed for homogeneous neutron matter with $\rho = 0.08 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ and $g = -250 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm}^3$.


A few notes:

- The cut-off energy $E_c$ should be larger than the Fermi energy.
- It is possible to introduce an even faster converging scheme for the pairing field with $E_c$ of a few $\Delta$'s only.
- Even though the pairing field was renormalized, the total energy should be computed with care, as the “pairing” and “kinetic” energies separately diverge.

\[ E_{gs} = \int d^3r [\mathcal{E}_N(r) + \mathcal{E}_S(r)]. \]
\[ \mathcal{E}_S(r) := -\Delta(r)\nu_c(r) = g_{eff}(r)|\nu_c(r)|^2 \]

Still diverges!

- One should now introduce the normal and the superfluid contributions to the Energy Density Functional (EDF).

Isospin symmetry

\[ \mathcal{E}_S(r) = g_0(r)|\nu_p(r) + \nu_n(r)|^2 + g_1(r)|\nu_p(r) - \nu_n(r)|^2 \]

We considered so far only the case $g_0 = g_1$. 
“Screening effects” are significant!

s-wave pairing gap in infinite neutron matter with realistic NN-interactions

These are major effects beyond the naive HFB
Peculiarity of the finite systems:
deep hole states are continuum states.

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
 h - \lambda & \Delta \\
 \Delta^+ & -(h^* - \lambda)
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
 u_k \\
 v_k
\end{pmatrix}
= E_k
\begin{pmatrix}
 u_k \\
 v_k
\end{pmatrix}
\]

outside  inside

Andreev reflection
Integration contours used to construct the normal and anomalous densities from the Gorkov Green functions


\[
\begin{pmatrix}
E - (h - \lambda) & -\Delta \\
\ast & \ast
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
G_{11} & G_{12} \\
G_{21} & G_{22}
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]

Even systems

Odd systems
The isotope and isotone chains treated by us are indicated with red numbers.
How well does the new approach work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Z = 20$</td>
<td>0.82/0.76</td>
<td>1.02/0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z = 28$</td>
<td>0.67/0.50</td>
<td>0.66/0.55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z = 40$</td>
<td>0.93/0.63</td>
<td>0.66/0.63</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z = 50$</td>
<td>0.29/0.21</td>
<td>0.43/0.35</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z = 82$</td>
<td>0.23/0.37</td>
<td>0.58/0.53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 50$</td>
<td>0.37/0.26</td>
<td>0.41/0.23</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 82$</td>
<td>0.43/0.31</td>
<td>0.50/0.56</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 126$</td>
<td>0.42/0.23</td>
<td>0.88/0.52</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. 23, S.Q. Zhang et al. nucl-th/0302032. - RMF
One-neutron separation energies

\[ S_n [\text{MeV}] = -c \rho \rho_0 \] (1)

Pairing Surface  Volume
\[ g(\vec{r}) = g \]

Volume + Surface pairing
\[ g(\vec{r}) = V_0 \left( 1 - \frac{\rho(\vec{r})}{\rho_c} \right) \]

Normal EDF:

- SLy4 - Chabanat et al.

- FaNDF\(^0\) – Fayans
  JETP Lett. 68, 169 (1998)
Two-neutron separation energies

\[ S_{2n} \text{ [MeV]} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{Sn} & : \text{SLy4} \quad \text{FaNDF}^0 \\
\text{Pb} & : \text{SLy4} \quad \text{FaNDF}^0
\end{align*}
One-nucleon separation energies

\[
\begin{align*}
S_p \, [\text{MeV}] & \quad \text{Exp.} & \quad \text{Volume} \\
N = 50 & \quad \text{FaNDF}^0 \\
N = 82 & \quad \text{FaNDF}^0 \\
N = 126 & \quad \text{FaNDF}^0 & \quad \text{Ca} \quad \text{FaNDF}^0
\end{align*}
\]
Spatial profiles of the pairing field for tin isotopes and two different (normal) energy density functionals.
Charge radii

• We use the same normal EDF as Fayans et al.
  volume pairing only with one universal constant
  5 parameters for pairing (density dependence with
  gradient terms (neutrons only).
  volume pairing, 5 parameters for pairing,
  isospin symmetry broken
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Borrowed from http://www.lsw.uni-heidelberg.de/~mcamenzi/NS_Mass.html
Landau criterion for superflow stability  
(flow without dissipation)

Consider a superfluid flowing in a pipe with velocity $v_s$:

$$E_0 + \frac{Nm v_s^2}{2} < E_0 + \epsilon_p + \vec{v}_s \cdot \vec{p} + \frac{Nm v_s^2}{2} \Rightarrow v_s < \frac{\epsilon_p}{p}$$

no internal excitations

One single quasi-particle excitation with momentum $p$

In the case of a Fermi superfluid this condition becomes

$$v_s < \frac{\Delta}{\hbar k_F}$$
Vortex in neutron matter

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  u_{\alpha kn}(\vec{r}) \\
  v_{\alpha kn}(\vec{r})
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
  u_{\alpha}(r) \exp[i(n + 1/2)\phi - ikz] \\
  v_{\alpha}(r) \exp[i(n - 1/2)\phi - ikz]
\end{pmatrix}, \quad n - \text{half-integer}
\]

\[
\Delta(\vec{r}) = \Delta(r) \exp(i\phi), \quad \vec{r} = (r, \phi, z) \text{ [cylindrical coordinates]}
\]

Oz - vortex symmetry axis

Ideal vortex, Onsager's quantization (one \(\hbar\) per Cooper pair)

\[
\vec{V}_v(\vec{r}) = \frac{\hbar}{2mr^2} (y,-x,0) \iff \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_C \vec{V}_v(\vec{r}) \cdot d\vec{r} = \frac{\hbar}{2m}
\]
Fayans’s FaNDF$^0$

\[
\Delta = \left( \frac{2}{e} \right)^{7/3} \frac{\hbar^2 k_F^2}{2m} \exp\left(- \frac{\pi}{2 \tan \delta(k_F)} \right)
\]

An additional factor of $1/(4e)^{1/3}$ is due to induced interactions. Again, HFB not valid.

FIG. 1. Diagrams for the induced interactions between two fermions in different internal states to second order in the effective interaction.
Distances scale with $l_F$ and $x \gg l_F$.
Dramatic structural changes of the vortex state naturally lead to significant changes in the energy balance of a neutron star.

- In low density region $\varepsilon(\rho_{out})\rho_{out} > \varepsilon(\rho_{in})\rho_{in}$
  which thus leads to a large anti-pinning energy $E_{pin}^{V} > 0$:

  $$E_{pin}^{V} = [\varepsilon(\rho_{out})\rho_{out} - \varepsilon(\rho_{in})\rho_{in}]V$$

- The energy per unit length is going to be changed dramatically when compared to previous estimates, by

  $$\frac{\Delta E_{vortex}}{L} \approx [\varepsilon(\rho_{out})\rho_{out} - \varepsilon(\rho_{in})\rho_{in}]\pi R^2$$

- Specific heat, transport properties are expected to significantly affected as well.
Vortices in dilute atomic Fermi systems in traps

✓ 1995 BEC was observed.
✓ 2000 vortices in BEC were created, thus BEC confirmed un-ambiguously.
✓ In 1999 DeMarco and Jin created a degenerate atomic Fermi gas.
✓ 2002 O’Hara, Hammer, Gehm, Granada and Thomas observed expansion of a Fermi cloud compatible with the existence of a superfluid fermionic phase.

Observation of stable/quantized vortices in Fermi systems would provide the ultimate and most spectacular proof for the existence of a Fermionic superfluid phase.
How can one put in evidence a vortex in a Fermi superfluid?

Hard to see, since density changes are not expected, unlike the case of a Bose superfluid.

What we learned from the structure of a vortex in low density neutron matter can help however.

If the gap is not small one can expect a noticeable density depletion along the vortex core, and the bigger the gap the bigger the depletion.

One can change the magnitude of the gap by altering the scattering length between two atoms with magnetic fields by means of a Feshbach resonance.
Feshbach resonance

\[ H = \frac{\vec{P}^2}{2\mu_r} + \sum_{i=1}^{2} (V_i^{hf} + V_i^Z) + V_0(\vec{r})P_0 + V_1(\vec{r})P_1 + V^d \]

\[ V^{hf} = \frac{a_{hf}}{\hbar^2} \vec{S}^e \cdot \vec{S}^n, \quad V^Z = (\gamma_n S_n^e - \gamma_n S_n^Z)B \]

Tiesinga, Verhaar, Stoof

Regal and Jin
Consider Bertsch’s MBX challenge (1999): “Find the ground state of infinite homogeneous neutron matter interacting with an infinite scattering length.”

- Carlson, Morales, Pandharipande and Ravenhall, nucl-th/0302041, with Green Function Monte Carlo (GFMC)

\[
\frac{E_N}{N} = \alpha_N \frac{3}{5} \varepsilon_F, \quad \alpha_N = 0.54
\]

This state is half the way from BCS→BEC crossover, the pairing correlations are in the strong coupling limit and HFB invalid again.

- Carlson, Chang, Pandharipande and Schmidt, physics/0303094, with GFMC

\[
\frac{E_S}{N} = \alpha_S \frac{3}{5} \varepsilon_F, \quad \alpha_S = 0.44
\]

normal state

superfluid state
Now one can construct an LDA functional to describe this new state of Fermionic matter

\[ \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{r}) n(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar^2}{m} \left[ \frac{m}{2m^*} \tau(\mathbf{r}) + \beta n(\mathbf{r})^{5/3} + \gamma \frac{|\nu(\mathbf{r})|^2}{n(\mathbf{r})^{1/3}} \right], \]

\[ n(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_\alpha |v_\alpha(\mathbf{r})|^2, \quad \tau(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_\alpha |\nabla v_\alpha(\mathbf{r})|^2, \]

\[ \nu(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_\alpha v^*_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) u_\alpha(\mathbf{r}). \]

- This form is not unique, as one can have either:
  - \( b=0 \) (set I) or \( b \neq 0 \) and \( m^*=m \) (set II).
- Gradient terms not determined yet (expected minor role).
The depletion along the vortex core is reminiscent of the corresponding density depletion in the case of a vortex in a Bose superfluid, when the density vanishes exactly along the axis for 100% BEC.

Solid lines are results for parameter set I, dashed lines for parameter set II (dots – velocity profile for ideal vortex).
40K (Fermi) atoms in a spherical harmonic trap

Effect of interaction, with and without weak and strong pairing correlations with fixed chemical potential.

$$m = 0.14 \times 10^{-10} \text{eV}, \, \hbar \omega = 0.568 \times 10^{-12} \text{eV},$$

$$a = -12.63 \text{nm} \text{ (when finite)}$$
40K (Fermi) atoms in a spherical harmonic trap

Effect of interaction, with and without weak and strong pairing correlations with fixed particle number, \( N = 5200 \).

\[ \hbar w = 0.568 \tilde{O} 10^{-12} \text{eV}, \ a = -12.63 \text{nm (when finite)} \]
Lessons:

- There are essentially no systems where the naïve BCS/HFB approximation works with reasonable accuracy. In nuclear/neutron matter one would need densities lower than $10^{-6}$ fm$^{-3}$ for the simple BCS formula and one would still be off by a factor of 2 in the gap.

- Even in dilute Fermi gases corrections to the BCS/HFB formalism are essential, even though often (but not always) $n|a|^{3}$.  

- Nuclei and neutron stars are essentially in the regime of strong coupling, even though in particular nuclei the pairing gaps are relatively small.

- No need for a finite range of the interaction so far in pairing and the big question is whether there are any nuclear phenomena in particular where the role of the finite range corrections in medium could be ascertained unambiguously!?
Summary

✓ LDA for Fermi systems with superfluid correlation is simple and easy to implement with all nuclear symmetries satisfied.

✓ The agreement between experiment and theory for one- and two-nucleon separation energies is spectacular, and likely there is lot of room for improvement.

✓ The simple form of the LDA functional suggest new facets of pairing worthy investigation \( g_0 \neq g_1 \).

✓ Application to other physical systems: neutron stars, dilute (and not) atomic systems straightforward and offering new qualitative results.

✓ A number of theoretical developments desirable: isoscalar and isovector density dependence of the pairing coupling, “effective range” corrections(?), linear response, EDF dependences on anomalous densities other than quadratic, pairing in other partial waves, coupling between neutron and proton pairing vibrations.