Evolution of the Normal State of a Strongly Interacting Fermi Gas from a Pseudogap Phase to a Molecular Bose Gas

A. Perali,[1] F. Palestini,[1] P. Pieri,[1] G. C. Strinati,[1] J. T. Stewart,[2] J. P. Gaebler,[2] T. E. Drake,[2] and D. S. Jin[2]

[1]*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Camerino, I-62032 Camerino, Italy*

[2]*JILA, NIST and University of Colorado, and Department of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0449, USA*

(Received 16 June 2010; revised manuscript received 11 November 2010; published 10 February 2011)

Wave-vector resolved radio frequency spectroscopy data for an ultracold trapped Fermi gas are reported for several couplings at T_c, and extensively analyzed in terms of a pairing-fluctuation theory. We map the evolution of a strongly interacting Fermi gas from the pseudogap phase into a fully gapped molecular Bose gas as a function of the interaction strength, which is marked by a rapid disappearance of a remnant Fermi surface in the single-particle dispersion. We also show that our theory of a pseudogap phase is consistent with a recent experimental observation as well as with quantum Monte Carlo data of thermodynamic quantities of a unitary Fermi gas above T_c.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.060402 PACS numbers: 05.30.Fk, 03.75.Hh, 67.85.−d, 74.40.−n

While the existence of a high-temperature superfluid phase in the BCS-BEC crossover of a strongly interacting Fermi gas is experimentally well established, important questions remain as to the nature of the gas above the superfluid transition temperature T_c. In particular, the question of whether or not a pseudogap state exists and how to identify it is of importance [1]. This question may have relevance to the controversy on the pseudogap state in the high-T_c cuprates. While the origin of this state in the cuprates is hotly debated, with atomic Fermi gases we can answer the simpler question of whether or not strong interactions and pairing fluctuations alone can lead to a pseudogap phase. This, in turn, tells us whether using such an approach to explain the pseudogap in the cuprates is a viable option or if other mechanisms are required.

As a function of increasing attractive interactions, a Fermi gas exhibits a crossover (the BCS-BEC crossover), from a weakly attractive Fermi gas with a superfluid transition explained by BCS theory, to a Fermi gas where attractions are so strong that the fermion pairs form molecules and the gas is described as a molecular Bose gas with a Bose-Einstein condensation transition. In the BCS limit the phenomena of Cooper pairing and superfluidity occur simultaneously at the phase transition, while in the BEC limit pairing and Bose condensation are decoupled with the pairing of fermions into molecules occurring well above the condensation temperature. The pseudogap phase refers to the normal state of a strongly interacting Fermi gas in the center of this crossover, where it is proposed that pairs exist above the superfluid transition in analogy with the normal state of the gas in the BEC limit. However, unlike the pairs in the BEC limit, the pairs in the pseudogap state have many-body character with the underlying Fermi statistics playing a crucial role, in analogy with the Cooper pairs of the BCS limit. A key prediction of theories of the pseudogap is that there should be a smooth evolution from the many-body pairs in the center of the crossover to the molecular pairs in the BEC limit [1,2] and accordingly, in order to verify the existence of a pseudogap phase, it is critical to examine the evolution of the spectral function from the center of the crossover to the molecular limit [3].

Based on two recent experiments, conflicting conclusions have been reached about the existence of a pseudogap state in the strongly interacting Fermi gas. On the one hand, thermodynamic measurements [4] have been interpreted as well described by Fermi-liquid theory, without the need for a pseudogap state. On the other hand, momentum-resolved radio frequency (rf) spectroscopy [5], which measures the single-particle spectral function, has been interpreted as evidence for a pseudogap state above T_c.

In this work, we present a theoretical investigation of the pseudogap regime based on the t-matrix pairing-fluctuation approach of Ref. [3], addressing both the single-particle spectral function and the thermodynamics of the gas, as a function of interaction strength in the BCS-BEC crossover. We find that, in the pseudogap regime, the single-particle dispersion backbends at a wave vector k_L near the Fermi wave vector k_F, indicating the existence of a remnant Fermi surface in this strongly interacting gas and the importance of Fermi statistics to the pairing. As interactions are increased towards the BEC limit, k_L disappears rapidly when entering the molecular regime. This picture is supported by a comparison of our theoretical results, where we include the effects of the trap, with new experimental data using momentum-resolved rf spectroscopy to probe the gas for different interaction strengths. In addition, we show that the theory also reproduces the observed linear behavior in the thermodynamics.

By the experimental technique introduced in Ref. [6], excitations of the trapped gas produced by an rf pulse are analyzed by time-of-flight imaging to determine the wave vector of the excited atoms once the trap has been switched off. The new data are presented with an improved

signal-to-noise ratio at T_c, which is accurately determined as the temperature where the condensate fraction disappears. We concentrate on the coupling range $0.0 \lesssim (k_F a_F)^{-1} \lesssim 1.0$, because the evolution of interest from the pseudogap state to the molecular Bose gas occurs on the positive side of the resonance. Here, a_F is the scattering length associated with the Fano-Feshbach resonance and k_F is given by $\hbar^2 k_F^2/(2m) = E_F = \hbar\omega_0(3N)^{1/3}$, where $\hbar$ is the Planck constant, m the atom mass, N the total number of atoms, and ω_0 the average trap frequency (we set $\hbar = 1$).

Ultracold Fermi gases are peculiar systems, in that their interparticle coupling can be increased to the point when a description in terms of a gas of molecular bosons holds, for which a real gap exists in the single-particle spectra. This molecular physics is of no interest in the context of the pseudogap, in a similar fashion of molecular binding in vacuum being distinct from Cooper pairing in the presence of a Fermi surface. The question then arises about what fermionic feature distinguishes the pseudogap from the molecular phase. We shall find that the backbending of the dispersions obtained from the single-particle spectral function $A(k, \omega)$ (with wave vector k and frequency ω) occurs at a wave vector k_L which remains close to k_F over a wide coupling range even approaching the molecular limit. We refer to this special wave vector as k_L because it is reminiscent of the Luttinger theorem [7], according to which in a Fermi liquid the radius k_F of the Fermi sphere is unaffected by the interaction.

Figure 1 compares the experimental and theoretical energy distribution curves (EDCs) at T_c for five different couplings in the window of interest (see Ref. [8] for details). We emphasize that the experimental data bear on an absolute normalization, in that only the integral over wave vector and energy of the EDCs has been normalized to unity [8]. For this reason, there is no independent normalization in the various panels at different k. This renders quite stringent the comparison with the theoretical calculations, which in turn contain no adjustable parameters.



FIG. 1 (color online). Experimental (circles) and theoretical (solid lines) EDCs for the trap at T_c, for several couplings and wave vectors.

Good agreement results from this comparison. In particular, the theoretical calculations well reproduce the asymmetry of the experimental curves between positive and negative energies, in addition to the peak positions, widths and heights (note how the latter change by about 1 order of magnitude from small to large k). Note further the excellent agreement between the theoretical and experimental negative energy tails, and the gradual flattening of the EDCs for increasing coupling due to the increase of intrapair correlations.

In Fig. 2 the dispersion and full width at half maximum of the peak at lower energies are reported over a dense set of k values for the same couplings of Fig. 1, and compared with our theoretical calculations. Note that a characteristic backbending is revealed from these dispersions [9]. This kind of backbending is typical of a BCS-like dispersion, and is associated with the presence of a pseudogap in a strongly interacting Fermi system [3,5,10–12]. In addition, the large values of the widths (which are at least of the order of E_F) and their asymmetric behavior between $k < k_F$ and $k > k_F$ are associated with strong deviations from the expected behavior of a normal Fermi liquid (which requires instead the quasiparticle widths to be vanishingly small at k_F [13]), and confirm the fact that single-particle states in this region constitute poor quasiparticles. Large values of the widths are not surprising in the context of the pseudogap physics that results from



FIG. 2 (color online). (a) Dispersions and (b) widths of the low-energy EDC peak. Experimental data (circles) and theoretical calculations for the trap (solid lines) are shown for the same couplings of Fig. 1, and compared with the contribution from the radial shell with the largest particle number (dashed lines). In the left panels the free-particle dispersion $k^2/(2m)$ is also reported for comparison (thin solid lines).

pairing fluctuations [3]. Large widths were also obtained by the self-consistent t-matrix approach of Ref. [14], which, however, masked the occurrence of a pseudogap near k_F.

It is relevant to discuss how trap averaging affects the above results, because different radial shells in the trap correspond to different locations in the coupling-vs-temperature phase diagram of the homogeneous system. A reasonable hypothesis is that the radial shell with the largest particle number (whose radius $r_{\max}$ is estimated to be $(0.5–0.6)R_F$ where $R_F = [2E_F/(m\omega_0^2)]^{1/2}$ is the Thomas-Fermi radius) contributes most to the total signal. The dispersions and widths contributed by this shell at $r_{\max}$ are represented by dashed lines in Fig. 2, which show good agreement with the complete calculation. This indicates that both the backbending of the dispersions and the associated large widths are not an artifact of trap averaging.

Despite these deviations from the behavior of a normal Fermi liquid, in the experimental data and theoretical calculations there yet appears a feature which is preserved from the physics of a Fermi liquid. That is the Luttinger wave vector k_L where the backbending occurs, which is plotted at T_c vs $(k_F a_F)^{-1}$ in Fig. 3, for a homogeneous [panel (a)] and trapped [panel (b)] system.

Figure 3(a) shows that for a homogeneous system k_L drops rapidly to zero when $(k_F a_F)^{-1} \simeq 0.75$, where the pseudogap in $A(k, \omega)$ turns into a real gap and the molecular limit is reached. Accordingly, we identify the boundary between the pseudogap and molecular phases where this drop occurs. Along this evolution into the molecular regime, the disappearance of the underlying Fermi surface about occurs when the molecular size becomes smaller than the interparticle spacing. The existence of a remnant Fermi surface with a volume consistent with the Luttinger theorem was already pointed out by ARPES for the pseudogap phase of high-T_c superconductors [15], but its importance for delimiting the pseudogap region



FIG. 3 (color online). (a) Coupling dependence of the Luttinger wave vector k_L for a homogeneous system at T_c, according to the theory of Ref. [3] (solid line) [the value at unitarity from the QMC calculation of Ref. [22] is also reported (star)]. The inset shows the temperature dependence of k_L at unitarity (solid line), and compares it with those obtained from the temperature dependence of the chemical potential of the noninteracting (dashed line) and interacting (dashed-dotted line) systems. (b) Theoretical (solid line) and experimental (squares) coupling dependence of k_L for the trap system at T_c.

was not appreciated in that context [16] because the interparticle interaction could not be controlled. The inset of Fig. 3(a) shows the temperature dependence of k_L for a homogeneous system at unitarity (solid line). At high temperatures when the pseudogap closes up, k_L is identified as the value where the dispersion of the peak at lower energy in $A(k, \omega)$ crosses the chemical potential [8]. This does not contradict our argument that at low temperatures the presence of a pseudogap requires an underlying Fermi surface, since at high temperatures the underlying Fermi surface of a Fermi liquid is not related to a pseudogap. The plot also shows the temperature dependence of $k_{\mu^0} = \sqrt{2m\mu^0(T)}$ (dashed line) and $k_\mu = \sqrt{2m\mu(T)}$ (dashed-dotted line), where $\mu^0(T)$ and $\mu(T)$ are the chemical potentials of the noninteracting and interacting Fermi systems, in the order, at the temperature T. Note that k_L about coincides with k_{μ^0}, while k_μ is not related with k_L.

Figure 3(b) shows the coupling dependence of k_L at T_c for the trapped system, for which the theoretical predictions can be compared with the experimental data (the latter are obtained by a BCS-like fit to the dispersions of Fig. 2(a), see Ref. [8]). The good comparison that results between theory and experiment confirms our identification of k_L as the relevant quantity for identifying the remnant Fermi characteristics of the system in the pseudogap phase.

However, the occurrence of a pseudogap for a unitary Fermi gas above T_c has recently been questioned, following Ref. [4] where a linear dependence of the equation of state as a function of $[k_B T/\mu(T)]^2$ (k_B being Boltzmann constant) was fitted by the Fermi-liquid equation of state and then interpreted [17] as evidence that the Fermi-liquid theory with no pseudogap can describe a unitary Fermi gas above T_c. To compare with the data of Ref. [4] and resolve this controversy, we have used the theoretical approach of Ref. [3], which contains a robust pseudogap associated with a non-Fermi-liquid behavior consistent with the data obtained by momentum-resolved rf spectroscopy, also to calculate the thermodynamic properties of a homogeneous system above T_c. Figure 4(a) reports the pressure in the grand-canonical ensemble vs $[k_B T/\mu(T)]^2$ as in Ref. [4], and shows that the linear behavior seen in the experimental data and quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) calculations also results from our t-matrix approach, both above and below the temperature at which the pseudogap appears (indicated by the vertical arrow). The inset of Fig. 4(a) shows that this linear behavior can be ascribed to the pronounced temperature dependence of the chemical potential, because a nonlinear behavior results when transforming $[k_B T/\mu(T)]^2$ to $(T/T_F)^2$ over the relevant range. The same change of variables can be performed in the experimental [18] and QMC [19,20] data, to obtain the total energy in the canonical ensemble as a function of $(T/T_F)^2$ reported in Fig. 4(b). This shows that in the new variable the linear behavior is lost.

Yet, it remains difficult to appreciate directly from this thermodynamic quantity the presence of a pseudogap in a



FIG. 4 (color online). Thermodynamics of a homogeneous Fermi gas at unitarity. (a) Pressure vs $[k_B T/\mu(T)]^2$: Experimental data from Ref. [4] (circles) are compared with QMC data from Refs. [19] (squares) and [20] (triangles), and with the t matrix (solid line). In the inset, the variable $[k_B T/\mu(T)]^2$ is transformed to $(T/T_F)^2$ according to the t matrix. (b) Energy vs $(T/T_F)^2$ at fixed density: Experimental data from Ref. [18] (circles) are compared with QMC data from Refs. [19] (squares) and [20] (triangles), and with the t matrix (solid line). Inset: density of states per spin (in units of $mk_F/(2\pi)^2$) for several temperatures in units of T_c according to the t matrix contrasted with the noninteracting (n.i.) result. (c) Specific heat per particle vs T/T_F obtained from the t matrix (solid line), the experimental data of Ref. [18] (circles), and the QMC data of Ref. [19] (squares)—the dashed-dotted line is a guide for the QMC data. The behavior of the n.i. Fermi gas (broken line) is reported for reference [8].

unitary Fermi gas above T_c even by the t-matrix calculation, despite the fact that a pseudogap is clearly present in the density of states obtained by the t matrix as shown in the inset of Fig. 4(b) where deviations from the noninteracting behavior $\sqrt{[\omega + \mu(T_c)]/E_F}$ are evident. Accordingly, by numerical differentiation of the energy data we have obtained in Fig. 4(c) the specific heat vs T/T_F. A sharp upturn of this quantity, beginning at a temperature T^* well above T_c where the pseudogap sets in, results clearly from the t-matrix calculation, and it is also visible from the QMC data at the corresponding value of T_c.

The experimental data in Fig. 4(c) appear too scattered to draw definite conclusions about the presence of the upturn and thus of a pseudogap above T_c. A similar upturn of the specific heat at a temperature T^* above T_c was measured in underdoped cuprates and interpreted as the onset of the pseudogap regime, whereby a "residual superconductivity" remains far above T_c [21].

In conclusion, we have provided clear experimental and theoretical evidence for non-Fermi-liquid behavior in the normal phase of a strongly interacting Fermi gas, which we have qualified in terms of a pseudogap picture. We have further shown that this picture is also consistent with the thermodynamic behavior of the system.

We acknowledge financial support from the NSF and from the Italian MIUR under Contract No. PRIN-2007 "Ultracold Atoms and Novel Quantum Phases".

[1] See, Q. Chen, Y. He, C. -C. Chien, and K. Levin, Rep. Prog. Phys. **72**, 122501 (2009), and references therein.
[2] M. Randeria, in *Models and Phenomenology for Conventional and High-temperature Superconductivity*, Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi," Course CXXXVI, edited by G. Iadonisi, J. R. Schrieffer, and M. L. Chiafalo (IOS Press, Amsterdam, 1998), p. 53.
[3] A. Perali, P. Pieri, G. C. Strinati, and C. Castellani, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 024510 (2002).
[4] S. Nascimbène, N. Navon, K. J. Jiang, F. Chevy, and C. Salomon, Nature (London) **463**, 1057 (2010).
[5] J. P. Gaebler, J. T. Stewart, T. E. Drake, D. S. Jin, A. Perali, P. Pieri, and G. C. Strinati, Nature Phys. **6**, 569 (2010).
[6] J. T. Stewart, J. P. Gaebler, and D. S. Jin, Nature (London) **454**, 744 (2008).
[7] J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **119**, 1153 (1960).
[8] See supplemental material at http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.060402.
[9] W. Schneider and M. Randeria, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 021601(R) (2010) pointed out that the universality of a Fermi gas with a contact interaction [23] yields a weak negatively dispersing spectral feature at $k \gg k_F$ even for a repulsive gas. In that case, however, this peak cannot be traced down to $k \simeq k_F$.
[10] Q. Chen and K. Levin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 190402 (2009).
[11] P. Magierski, G. Wlazlowski, A. Bulgac, and J. E. Drut, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210403 (2009).
[12] S. Tsuchiya, R. Watanabe, and Y. Ohashi, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 033613 (2009); **82**, 033629 (2010).
[13] P. Nozières, *Theory of Interacting Fermi Systems* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1964).
[14] R. Haussmann, M. Punk, and W. Zwerger, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 063612 (2009).
[15] F. Ronning *et al.*, Science **282**, 2067 (1998).
[16] C. Kusko and R. S. Markiewicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 963 (2000).
[17] Y-il Shin, Nature (London) **463**, 1029 (2010).
[18] S. Nascimbène, N. Navon, F. Chevy, and C. Salomon, arXiv:1006.4052v1.
[19] A. Bulgac, J. Drut, and P. Magierski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 90 404 (2006).
[20] E. Burovski, N. Prokofev, B. Svistunov, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 160402 (2006).
[21] H. -H. Wen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 067002 (2009).
[22] J. Carlson and S. Reddy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 060401 (2005).
[23] S. Tan, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **323**, 2971 (2008).