

Some Aspects of Fermion Cooper Pairing with Unequal Masses

Lianyi He, Meng Jin and Pengfei Zhuang

Physics Department, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Some aspects of fermion Cooper pairing with unequal mass masses are investigated in this paper. Within a standard field theory approach, we derived the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared of the $U(1)$ gauge field or the London penetration depth in a general two species model. The belief that the superfluid density is proportional to the Meissner mass squared or inverse London penetration depth squared is broken when the fermion masses are unequal. We calculated the superfluid mass density and the Meissner mass squared in the breached pairing (BP) state. In weak coupling region, the superfluid density is always negative but the Meissner mass squared becomes mostly positive when the mass ratio between the pairing fermions is large enough. This phenomenon indicates that the momentum configuration of the LOFF pairing with unequal masses should be correctly established. The energetically favored single wave LOFF state is physically equivalent to the state with a spontaneous generated superflow. The extension to finite range pairing interaction is briefly discussed. The superfluid density can be positive with proper momentum structure of the interaction.

PACS numbers: 13.60.Rj, 11.10.Wx, 25.75.-q

I. INTRODUCTION

The asymmetric cooper pairing between different species of fermions with mismatched Fermi surfaces, which was discussed many years ago, promoted new interest in both theoretic and experimental studies in recent years. The mismatched Fermi surfaces can be realized, for instance, in a superconductor with Zeeman splitting induced by an external field[1, 2, 3, 4], an atomic fermion gas composed of two species of atoms with different densities and/or masses[5, 6], an isospin asymmetric nuclear matter with proton-neutron pairing[7], and color superconducting quark matter with charge neutrality[8, 9, 10]. Among the mechanisms which can produce asymmetry between the pairing fermions, the mass difference is a very robust one. The cooper pairing between fermions with unequal masses was firstly investigated by V.Liu and F.Wilczek[11]. They considered a fermion gas composed of light and heavy fermions with attractive interaction. A homogeneous and isotropic pairing state which is similar to the Sarma state[1] was proposed to be the ground state of such systems. Such an exotic pairing state is now called breached pairing (BP) state or interior gap (IG) state. In the BP state there exists gapless fermionic excitations, and the superfluid Fermi gas and the normal Fermi gas coexist in the momentum space.

It was found many years ago that the Sarma state suffers a thermodynamic instability, i.e., the so called Sarma instability[1]. It is now generally accepted that the Sarma instability can be cured in several systems, such as the systems with long-range interaction where charge neutrality is required[9, 10], the systems with proper finite range attractive interaction between the two species of fermions with large mass difference[12], and the superfluid fermion gas with density imbalance in the strong coupling region[13, 14, 15, 16]. While the Sarma instability can be cured, it was soon found that the superfluid density of the BP state is negative[17] and the free en-

ergy of the mixed phase is lower than BP state[18, 19]. Meanwhile, in the study of color superconductivity, it was found that the gapless color superconductors possess paramagnetic response to external color magnetic fields, i.e., the Meissner masses squared of some gluons are negative[20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. All these phenomenons indicate that the homogeneous and isotropic BP state is unstable and some spatially inhomogeneous and isotropic states are energetically favored[25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31]. The superfluid density is a very fundamental quantity in superconductivity. It is well known that the superfluid density is proportional to the Meissner mass squared of the gauge field or inverse of the London penetration depth squared, and the superfluid density is often measured via the London penetration depth in experiments. Due to this relation, one may regard the negative superfluid density observed in the BP state and the negative Meissner mass squared observed in the gapless color superconductors as the same instability.

However, nearly all these studies focus on the systems where the masses of the pairing fermions are equal (the strange quark mass in three flavor superconducting quark matter is treated as a shift of chemical potential in high density effective theory). Are there any new features in unequal mass systems? In the study of superfluid stability of the interior gap states, S.T.Wu and S.Yip derived a formula of the superfluid density of non-relativistic asymmetric fermion superfluids with the concept of quasiparticles[17]. In the equal mass case, we find their formula is consistent with the result calculated from the linear response theory[32], the current-current correlation function[33], and the Meissner mass squared[34]. However, in unequal mass systems, the formula of superfluid density seems quite different from the Meissner mass squared[34]. Does the relation that the superfluid density is proportional to the Meissner mass squared hold in unequal mass systems? In this paper, we will derive the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared in

unequal mass systems within a standard field theory approach which treats the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared in a same manner. We find both formulae for the superfluid density[17] and the Meissner mass squared[34] are right, and the belief that the superfluid density is proportional to the Meissner mass squared is generally broken down in unequal mass systems. As a consequence, the momentum configuration of the LOFF state should be correctly established in unequal mass systems. We show that the energetically favored single wave LOFF state is physically equivalent to a isotropic state with spontaneous generated superflow.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we briefly review the formalism of the two species model. In Section III, we derive the formula of the superfluid density from first principle and compare it with S.T.Wu and S.Yip's phenomenological method. In Section IV, we derive the Meissner mass squared and show that it is not proportional to the superfluid density in unequal mass systems. The superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared in the breached pairing states are calculated in Section V. The LOFF pairing in unequal mass systems is discussed in Section VI. The generalization to finite range pairing interaction is briefly discussed in Section VII. We summarize in Section VIII. We use the natural unit of $c = \hbar = 1$ through the paper.

II. THE TWO SPECIES MODEL

The physical system we are interested in in this paper is an idea system composed of two species of fermions with attractive interaction. The microscopic theory of the system can be modeled by the following Lagrangian density(in the path integral framework with imaginary time $\tau = it$):

$$\mathcal{L} = \psi_i^* \left[-\partial_\tau + \frac{\nabla^2}{2m_i} + \mu_i \right] \psi_i + g \psi_a^* \psi_b^* \psi_b \psi_a \quad (1)$$

where $\psi_i \equiv \psi_i(x)$ with $x = (\tau, \vec{x})$ are fermion fields for the two species a and b , the coupling constant g is positive to keep the interaction attractive, m_a and m_b are the masses for the two species and μ_a and μ_b their chemical potentials.(Throughout, summation is implicit over repeated specie index.)

The key quantity to describe a statistical mechanical system is the partition function Z . In our model it can be expressed as

$$Z = \int [d\psi_i][d\psi_i^*] e^{\int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^3\vec{x} \mathcal{L}[\psi_i, \psi_i^*]} \quad (2)$$

in the imaginary time formalism of finite temperature field theory with β inverse of the temperature T . For attractive interaction g , we can perform an exact Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation to introduce the auxiliary boson field $\phi(x)$ and its complex conjugate $\phi^*(x)$. With

the Nambu-Gorkov fields Ψ, Ψ^* defined as

$$\Psi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_a \\ \psi_b^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Psi^*(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_a^* & \psi_b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

we can express the partition function as

$$Z = \int [d\Psi][d\Psi^*][d\phi][d\phi^*] e^{\int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^3x (\bar{\Psi} K \Psi + |\phi|^2/g)} \quad (4)$$

with the kernel $K[\phi]$ defined as

$$K[\phi] = \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_\tau + \frac{\nabla^2}{2m_a} + \mu_a & \phi \\ \phi^* & -\partial_\tau - \frac{\nabla^2}{2m_b} - \mu_b \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

In the mean field approximation, we replace ϕ and ϕ^* by their ensemble averages Δ and Δ^* . In a homogenous and isotropic state, they are independent of coordinates. Then we can directly evaluate the Gaussian path integral to obtain the thermodynamic potential density

$$\Omega = \frac{|\Delta|^2}{g} - T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \quad (6)$$

in terms of the inverse fermion propagator

$$\mathcal{G}^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega_n - \epsilon_{\vec{p}}^a & \Delta \\ \Delta^* & i\omega_n + \epsilon_{\vec{p}}^b \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

with $\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^i = \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2m_i} - \mu_i$ dispersions of free fermions. The explicit form of the fermion propagator which we need in the following sections can be explicitly expressed as

$$\mathcal{G}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{G}_{11}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) & \mathcal{G}_{12}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \\ \mathcal{G}_{21}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) & \mathcal{G}_{22}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

with the matrix elements

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{11}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) &= \frac{i\omega_n - \epsilon_A + \epsilon_S}{(i\omega_n - \epsilon_A)^2 - \epsilon_\Delta^2}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{22}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) &= \frac{i\omega_n - \epsilon_A - \epsilon_S}{(i\omega_n - \epsilon_A)^2 - \epsilon_\Delta^2}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{12}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) &= \frac{-\Delta}{(i\omega_n - \epsilon_A)^2 - \epsilon_\Delta^2}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{21}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) &= \frac{-\Delta}{(i\omega_n - \epsilon_A)^2 - \epsilon_\Delta^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here the quantities ϵ_S, ϵ_A and ϵ_Δ are defined as

$$\epsilon_{S,A} = \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^a \pm \epsilon_{\vec{p}}^b), \quad \epsilon_\Delta = \sqrt{\epsilon_S^2 + |\Delta|^2}. \quad (10)$$

Since all quantities depend only on $|\Delta|$, we can set Δ to be real from now on. From the pole of the fermion propagator we can read the dispersions $\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^A$ and $\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^B$ of fermionic quasiparticles:

$$\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^A = \epsilon_\Delta + \epsilon_A, \quad \epsilon_{\vec{p}}^B = \epsilon_\Delta - \epsilon_A. \quad (11)$$

If $\epsilon_A = 0$, we recover the well know BCS type excitation. The asymmetric part ϵ_A is the key mechanism to produce the exotic pairing states such as breached pairing state.

The occupation numbers of the two species of fermions can be calculated via the diagonal elements of the fermion propagator, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} n_a(\vec{p}) &= T \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sum_n \mathcal{G}_{11}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) e^{i\omega_n \eta}, \\ n_b(\vec{p}) &= -T \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sum_n \mathcal{G}_{22}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) e^{-i\omega_n \eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Completing the Matsubara frequency summation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n_a(\vec{p}) &= u_p^2 f(\epsilon_p^A) + v_p^2 f(-\epsilon_p^B), \\ n_b(\vec{p}) &= u_p^2 f(\epsilon_p^B) + v_p^2 f(-\epsilon_p^A) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

with the coherent coefficients $u_p^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_S}{\epsilon_\Delta}\right)$ and $v_p^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_S}{\epsilon_\Delta}\right)$. The particle number densities n_a and n_b for the species a and b are obtained by integration over the whole momentum space.

III. THE SUPERFLUID DENSITY

In this section we try to derive the superfluid density in a standard field theory approach. When the superfluid moves with a uniform but small velocity \vec{v}_s , the condensates transform as $\Delta \rightarrow \Delta e^{2i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}}$, $\Delta^* \rightarrow \Delta^* e^{-2i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}}$ with $2\vec{q} = (m_a + m_b)\vec{v}_s$ the total momentum of the cooper pair, meanwhile the fermion fields transform as $\psi_a \rightarrow \psi_a e^{i\vec{q}_a \cdot \vec{x}}$, $\psi_b \rightarrow \psi_b e^{i\vec{q}_b \cdot \vec{x}}$ with $\vec{q}_a = m_a \vec{v}_s$, $\vec{q}_b = m_b \vec{v}_s$ the momenta for the two species of fermions which satisfy $\vec{q}_a + \vec{q}_b = 2\vec{q}$. The superfluid density tensor ρ_{ij} is defined as[37]

$$\Omega(\vec{v}_s) = \Omega(\vec{0}) + \vec{j}_s \cdot \vec{v}_s + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{ij} (\vec{v}_s)_i (\vec{v}_s)_j + \dots \quad (14)$$

For a homogeneous and isotropic superfluids, we have $\rho_{ij} = \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \rho_s$. Thus the above formula can be reduced to

$$\Omega(\vec{v}_s) = \Omega(\vec{0}) + \vec{j}_s \cdot \vec{v}_s + \frac{1}{2} \rho_s \vec{v}_s^2 + \dots \quad (15)$$

Here ρ_s is just the superfluid (mass) density which is a very fundamental quantity in fermion superfluidity and superconductivity. When ρ_s is negative, the homogeneous and isotropic state is unstable and a state with spontaneous generated superflow which breaks the rotational symmetry is energetically favored.

After the transformation of the condensates and the fermion fields, we find the thermodynamic potential changes into

$$\Omega(\vec{v}_s) = \frac{\Delta^2}{g} - T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}_s^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \quad (16)$$

in terms of a \vec{v}_s -dependent inverse propagator

$$\mathcal{G}_s^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega_n - \epsilon_{\vec{p}+\vec{q}_a}^a & \Delta \\ \Delta & i\omega_n + \epsilon_{\vec{p}-\vec{q}_b}^b \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

Using the relation

$$\mathcal{G}_s^{-1} = \mathcal{G}^{-1} - 1\vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s - \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_m \vec{v}_s^2 \quad (18)$$

with the matrix $\Sigma_m = \text{diag}(m_a, -m_b)$, we can do the derivative expansion as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}_s^{-1} - \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}^{-1} &= \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{\vec{v}_s^2}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G} \Sigma_m) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s)^2 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G} \mathcal{G}) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

With this expansion, we can expand $\Omega(\vec{v}_s)$ in powers of \vec{v}_s . The superfluid density can be read from the quadratic terms in \vec{v}_s . After some direct algebras, we obtain

$$\rho_s = m_a n_a + m_b n_b + \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} (\mathcal{T}_{11} + \mathcal{T}_{22} + 2\mathcal{T}_{12}) \quad (20)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{11}, \mathcal{T}_{22}, \mathcal{T}_{12}$ are the fermion Matsubara frequency summations defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{11} &= T \sum_n \mathcal{G}_{11} \mathcal{G}_{11}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{22} &= T \sum_n \mathcal{G}_{22} \mathcal{G}_{22}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{12} &= T \sum_n \mathcal{G}_{12} \mathcal{G}_{21}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

These summations can be directly evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{11} &= u_p^2 v_p^2 \frac{f(\epsilon_p^A) + f(\epsilon_p^B) - 1}{\epsilon_\Delta} + u_p^4 f'(\epsilon_p^A) + v_p^4 f'(\epsilon_p^B), \\ \mathcal{T}_{22} &= u_p^2 v_p^2 \frac{f(\epsilon_p^A) + f(\epsilon_p^B) - 1}{\epsilon_\Delta} + v_p^4 f'(\epsilon_p^A) + u_p^4 f'(\epsilon_p^B), \\ \mathcal{T}_{12} &= u_p^2 v_p^2 \left[\frac{1 - f(\epsilon_p^A) - f(\epsilon_p^B)}{\epsilon_\Delta} + f'(\epsilon_p^A) + f'(\epsilon_p^B) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Here $f(x)$ is the Fermi distribution function and $f'(x) = df(x)/dx$. Using these results we get

$$\rho_s = m_a n_a + m_b n_b + \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} [f'(\epsilon_p^A) + f'(\epsilon_p^B)] \quad (23)$$

One can easily check that this formula is invariant under the exchange $a \leftrightarrow b$. When $\Delta = 0$, i.e., in the normal state, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s &= \int_0^\infty \frac{dp p^2}{2\pi^2} [m_a f(\epsilon_p^a) + m_b f(\epsilon_p^b)] \\ &\quad + \int_0^\infty \frac{dp p^4}{6\pi^2} [f'(\epsilon_p^a) + f'(\epsilon_p^b)]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

For any mass m and chemical potential μ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \frac{dp p^2}{3\pi^2} \frac{p^2}{2m} f' \left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - \mu \right) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{dp p^2}{2\pi^2} f \left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - \mu \right), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

hence ρ_s vanishes automatically in the normal state.

In fact, this result we obtained in such a standard derivation is in agreement with the formula derived by S.T.Wu and S.Yip with a phenomenological method[17]. According to S.T.Wu and S.Yip's method, in presence of a small superfluid velocity \vec{v}_s , the quasiparticle energies are shifted by $\vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s$ and the occupation numbers change into

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{n}_a(\vec{p}) &= u_p^2 f(\epsilon_p^A + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s) + v_p^2 f(-\epsilon_p^B + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s), \\ \tilde{n}_b(\vec{p}) &= u_p^2 f(\epsilon_p^B + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s) + v_p^2 f(-\epsilon_p^A + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The number current can be decomposed to diamagnetic part and paramagnetic part:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{J}_i^d &= \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \tilde{n}_i(\vec{p}) \vec{v}_s \equiv \rho_i^d \vec{v}_s, \\ \vec{J}_i^p &= \frac{1}{m_i} \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \vec{p} \tilde{n}_i(\vec{p}) \equiv \rho_i^p \vec{v}_s. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

To leading order in \vec{v}_s , we have $\rho_i^d = n_i$. Using the fact $\vec{J}_i^p = 0$ when $\vec{v}_s = 0$, i.e.,

$$\vec{J}_i^p = \frac{1}{m_i} \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \vec{p} (\tilde{n}_i(\vec{p}) - n_i(\vec{p})), \quad (28)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a^p &= \frac{1}{m_a} \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} [u_p^2 f'(\epsilon_p^A) + v_p^2 f'(\epsilon_p^B)], \\ \rho_b^p &= \frac{1}{m_b} \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} [u_p^2 f'(\epsilon_p^B) + v_p^2 f'(\epsilon_p^A)]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The total superfluid (mass) density is defined as $\rho_s = m_a \rho_a + m_b \rho_b$ with $\rho_i = \rho_i^d + \rho_i^p$. Using the fact $u_p^2 + v_p^2 = 1$, we find it is exactly the formula we have just obtained. For our derivation, we can also decompose the superfluid density into two parts

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s^a &= m_a n_a + \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} (\mathcal{T}_{11} + \mathcal{T}_{12}), \\ \rho_s^b &= m_b n_b + \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} (\mathcal{T}_{22} + \mathcal{T}_{12}), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\rho_s^a \equiv m_a \rho_a$ and $\rho_s^b \equiv m_b \rho_b$ can be defined as the superfluid densities for the two species of fermions respectively.

One may ask why these two derivations give the same result. In fact, in presence of a small superflow \vec{v}_s , the quasiparticle dispersions can be read from $\det \mathcal{G}_s^{-1} = 0$.

After a simple algebra, we get the modified dispersions for the quasiparticles

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\epsilon}_p^A &= \sqrt{\tilde{\epsilon}_S^2 + \Delta^2} + \tilde{\epsilon}_A + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s, \\ \tilde{\epsilon}_p^B &= \sqrt{\tilde{\epsilon}_S^2 + \Delta^2} - \tilde{\epsilon}_A - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\epsilon}_S &= \epsilon_S + \frac{1}{4}(m_a + m_b)\vec{v}_s^2, \\ \tilde{\epsilon}_A &= \epsilon_A + \frac{1}{4}(m_a - m_b)\vec{v}_s^2. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Thus to leading order in \vec{v}_s , the quasiparticle energies are really shifted by $\vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s$. However, one should note that the derivation with the concept of quasiparticle is inconsistent. The particle occupation numbers in presence of a superflow should be

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{n}_a(\vec{p}) &= u_p^2 f(\epsilon_p^A + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s) + v_p^2 f(-\epsilon_p^B + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s), \\ \tilde{n}_b(\vec{p}) &= u_p^2 f(\epsilon_p^B - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s) + v_p^2 f(-\epsilon_p^A - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}_s) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

to leading order in \vec{v}_s . In fact, using this correct occupation numbers, one can not obtain the correct result since ρ_b^p will change a sign. We guess that for such an asymmetric system, one can not self-consistently derived the superfluid density with the concept of quasiparticles. Only for the symmetric systems like the standard BCS case, such a method valid as discussed in the text books.

In the end of this section, we should point out:

1) The formula of the superfluid density we have derived here is in principle only suitable for the grand canonical ensemble where the chemical potentials μ_a, μ_b are fixed[38]. In some systems where the particle numbers n_a, n_b are fixed or the total number $n = n_a + n_b$ is fixed, we should use the free energy F to calculate the superfluid density instead of the thermodynamic potential Ω . However, such a correction is very slight in an isotropic state[39] and hence we can safely apply the above formula to the systems with fixed particle numbers.

2) In our derivation, the assumption of weak coupling is not used. So it can be applied to study the superfluid stability in the BCS-BEC crossover in a light-heavy fermion gas such as a mixture of ${}^6\text{Li}$ and ${}^{40}\text{K}$. In recent studies on BCS-BEC crossover in equal mass systems, it was found that the BP state is stable in the BEC region, i.e., it is free from Sarma instability and negative superfluid density[13]. We expect such a stable BP state will also be realized in a light-heavy fermion gas at strong coupling.

IV. THE MEISSNER MASS

The two species model is invariant under the following phase transformation

$$\psi_i(x) \rightarrow e^{i\varphi_i} \psi_i(x), \quad \phi(x) \rightarrow e^{i(\varphi_a + \varphi_b)} \phi(x), \quad (34)$$

with arbitrary and constant phases φ_a and φ_b , which means the symmetry group of the model is $U(1)_{\varphi_a} \otimes U(1)_{\varphi_b}$. The order parameter is invariant only when $\varphi_a = -\varphi_b$. Hence in presence of a nonzero expectation value of ϕ , the symmetry group is spontaneously broken down to a $U(1)$ subgroup

$$U(1)_{\varphi_a} \otimes U(1)_{\varphi_b} \rightarrow U(1)_{\varphi_a - \varphi_b}. \quad (35)$$

The unbroken $U(1)$ subgroup corresponds to the phase difference $\Delta\varphi = \varphi_a - \varphi_b$ and a Goldstone mode corresponding to the total phase $\varphi = \varphi_a + \varphi_b$ will appear. Let us introduce a model $U(1)$ gauge field A_μ and then the Lagrangian becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = \psi_i^* \left[-D_{\tau i} + \frac{\vec{D}_i^2}{2m_i} + \mu_i \right] \psi_i + g\psi_a^* \psi_b^* \psi_b \psi_a + \mathcal{L}_A \quad (36)$$

with $D_{\mu i} = \partial_\mu - ieQ_i A_\mu$. Here \mathcal{L}_A is the gauge field sector which is not shown explicitly and eQ_a, eQ_b are the gauge couplings for the two species of fermions. In presence of a gauge field, the Goldstone mode disappears and the gauge field will obtain a mass m_A via Higgs mechanism. This is nothing but the Meissner effect in superconductivity and the mass m_A the gauge field obtains is called Meissner mass.

In this section we try to derive the Meissner mass m_A in the same manner as the superfluid density ρ_s . The standard way to calculate the Meissner mass or the London penetration depth is to evaluate the polarization tensor $\Pi_{\mu\nu}(K)$ for the gauge field. For our model by hand, the spatial components of the polarization tensor reads

$$\Pi_{ij}(K) = \Pi_{ij}^d(K) + \Pi_{ij}^p(K) \quad (37)$$

with the diamagnetic part

$$\Pi_{ij}^d(K) = \delta_{ij} e^2 \frac{T}{V} \sum_P \text{Tr}[\mathcal{G}(P) \Sigma_d] \quad (38)$$

and the paramagnetic part

$$\Pi_{ij}^p(K) = e^2 \frac{T}{V} \sum_P p_i p_j \text{Tr}[\mathcal{G}(P_+) \Sigma_p \mathcal{G}(P_-) \Sigma_p]. \quad (39)$$

Here $P_\pm = P \pm K/2$, and the matrices Σ_d and Σ_p are defined as

$$\Sigma_d = \text{diag} \left(\frac{Q_a^2}{m_a}, -\frac{Q_b^2}{m_b} \right), \quad \Sigma_p = \text{diag} \left(\frac{Q_a}{m_a}, \frac{Q_b}{m_b} \right). \quad (40)$$

Note that the paramagnetic part is just the current-current correlation function. The current-current correlation function gives both diamagnetic part and paramagnetic part in relativistic systems[20, 21], but gives only paramagnetic part in non-relativistic systems. The Meissner mass m_A can be evaluated by

$$m_A^2 = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\vec{k} \rightarrow 0} (\delta_{ij} - \hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j) \Pi_{ij}(0, \vec{k}). \quad (41)$$

If m_A^2 is negative, the homogeneous and isotropic state suffers the magnetic instability[20, 21] and a state with gauge field condensation $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \neq 0$ which breaks the rotational symmetry is energetically favored.

For a clear comparison of the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared in unequal mass systems, we here employ another approach[34] to evaluate the Meissner mass squared. The Meissner mass squared can be calculated via the response of the effective potential to an external transverse vector potential. In presence of a small external vector potential $\mathbf{A}(0, \vec{q} \rightarrow 0)$ in the static and long wave limit, the effective potential of the system can be expanded in powers of \mathbf{A} ,

$$\Omega(\mathbf{A}) = \Omega(0) + \mathbf{J}_A \cdot \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{A} \cdot M_{ij}^2 \cdot \mathbf{A} + \dots, \quad (42)$$

with the coefficients

$$M_{ij}^2 = \left. \frac{\partial^2 \Omega(\mathbf{A})}{\partial A_i \partial A_j} \right|_{\mathbf{A}=0}. \quad (43)$$

The coefficients M_{ij}^2 are just the components of the Meissner mass squared tensor. In a homogenous and isotropic superconductor, we have $M_{ij}^2 = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and $M_{11}^2 = M_{22}^2 = M_{33}^2$, and the Meissner mass squared m_A^2 is defined as

$$m_A^2 = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^3 M_{ii}^2. \quad (44)$$

For our model by hand, the thermodynamic potential in presence of an static and long wave vector potential \mathbf{A} can be expressed as

$$\Omega(\mathbf{A}) = \frac{\Delta^2}{g} - T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}_A^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \quad (45)$$

with a \mathbf{A} -dependent inverse propagator

$$\mathcal{G}_A^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega_n - \frac{\epsilon_a^a}{\vec{p} + eQ_a \mathbf{A}} & \Delta \\ \Delta & i\omega_n + \frac{\epsilon_b^b}{\vec{p} - eQ_b \mathbf{A}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

Up to now, the same trick in Section III can be applied directly. In this case we have the relation

$$\mathcal{G}_A^{-1} = \mathcal{G}^{-1} - e \Sigma_p \vec{p} \cdot \mathbf{A} - \frac{e^2}{2} \Sigma_d \mathbf{A}^2 \quad (47)$$

as well as the derivative expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}_A^{-1} - \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}^{-1} &= e \vec{p} \cdot \mathbf{A} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G} \Sigma_p) \\ &- \frac{e^2}{2} \mathbf{A}^2 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G} \Sigma_d) - \frac{e^2}{2} (\vec{p} \cdot \mathbf{A})^2 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G} \Sigma_p \mathcal{G} \Sigma_p) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The Meissner mass squared can be read from the quadratic terms in \mathbf{A} . After some algebras we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_A^2 &= e^2 \left(\frac{n_a}{m_a} Q_a^2 + \frac{n_b}{m_b} Q_b^2 \right) \\ &+ e^2 \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} \left(\frac{Q_a^2}{m_a^2} \mathcal{T}_{11} + \frac{Q_b^2}{m_b^2} \mathcal{T}_{22} + \frac{2Q_a Q_b}{m_a m_b} \mathcal{T}_{12} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The second term of the above formula, is just the long-wave and static limit of the current-current correlation

function. With the result of frequency summations in Section III, we get a explicit expression:

$$m_A^2 = e^2 \left(\frac{n_a}{m_a} Q_a^2 + \frac{n_b}{m_b} Q_b^2 \right) + e^2 \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} \times \left[\left(\frac{Q_a}{m_a} - \frac{Q_b}{m_b} \right)^2 u_p^2 v_p^2 \frac{f(\epsilon_p^A) + f(\epsilon_p^B) - 1}{\epsilon_\Delta} + \left(\frac{Q_a}{m_a} u_p^2 + \frac{Q_b}{m_b} v_p^2 \right)^2 f'(\epsilon_p^A) + \left(\frac{Q_a}{m_a} v_p^2 + \frac{Q_b}{m_b} u_p^2 \right)^2 f'(\epsilon_p^B) \right]. \quad (50)$$

The formula is also invariant under the exchange $a \leftrightarrow b$. When $\Delta = 0$, it reduces to

$$m_A^2 = e^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{dp p^2}{2\pi^2} \left[\frac{f(\epsilon_p^a)}{m_a} Q_a^2 + \frac{f(\epsilon_p^b)}{m_b} Q_b^2 \right] + e^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{dp p^4}{6\pi^2} \left[\frac{f'(\epsilon_p^a)}{m_a^2} Q_a^2 + \frac{f'(\epsilon_p^b)}{m_b^2} Q_b^2 \right]. \quad (51)$$

Hence the Meissner mass is just zero in the normal state with $\Delta = 0$ as we expect.

The formulae of the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared we have derived seem quite different. When is the superfluid density proportional to the Meissner mass squared? Obviously, for the classical case $m_a = m_b \equiv m$ and $Q_a = Q_b = 1$ in superconductivity, we recover the well know result [32, 33]

$$\rho_s = mn + \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} [f'(\epsilon_p^A) + f'(\epsilon_p^B)],$$

$$m_A^2 = \frac{ne^2}{m} + \frac{e^2}{m^2} \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2}{3} [f'(\epsilon_p^A) + f'(\epsilon_p^B)], \quad (52)$$

and we have exactly

$$\frac{\rho_s}{m_A^2} = \frac{m^2}{e^2} \quad (53)$$

at any temperature $T < T_c$. In fact, one can easily observe that when $Q_a/m_a = Q_b/m_b$, i.e., the two species possess the same charge-mass ratio, the relation $\rho_s \propto m_A^2$ holds at any temperature $T < T_c$. Otherwise this relation is generally broken down.

V. THE BREACHED PAIRING STATE

We calculate the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared for the breached pairing state at zero temperature in this section. Explicitly, the dispersions of the fermionic quasiparticles can be expressed as

$$\epsilon_p^{A,B} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - \mu \right)^2 + \Delta^2} \pm \left(\frac{p^2}{2m_c} + \delta\mu \right) \quad (54)$$

with the reduced masses $m = \frac{2m_a m_b}{m_a + m_b}$, $m_c = \frac{2m_a m_b}{m_b - m_a}$ and chemical potentials $\mu = \frac{\mu_a + \mu_b}{2}$, $\delta\mu = \frac{\mu_b - \mu_a}{2}$. One can easily check that when

$$\Delta < \Delta_c = \frac{|p_b^2 - p_a^2|}{4\sqrt{m_a m_b}}, \quad (55)$$

with $p_i = \sqrt{2m_i \mu_i}$, one branch of the fermionic quasiparticles can cross the momentum axis and hence becomes gapless. This is the so called breached pairing state or interior gap state[11]. The gapless nodes determined by $\epsilon_p^A = 0$ or $\epsilon_p^B = 0$ are at $p = p_{1,2}$ with

$$p_{1,2}^2 = \frac{p_a^2 + p_b^2}{2} \mp \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(p_a^2 - p_b^2)^2 - 16m_a m_b \Delta^2}. \quad (56)$$

The gap equation which determines Δ at zero temperature reads

$$1 - g \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Theta(\epsilon_p^A) - \Theta(-\epsilon_p^B)}{2\sqrt{\left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - \mu \right)^2 + \Delta^2}} = 0. \quad (57)$$

Here $\Theta(x)$ is the step function. We suppose the attractive interaction is restricted in a narrow region $p_0 - \Lambda < |\vec{p}| < p_0 + \Lambda$ with $\Lambda \ll p_0$ where $p_0 = \sqrt{2m\mu}$ satisfying $\epsilon_S = 0$. Λ or the corresponding Debye energy ω_D then serves as a nature ultraviolet cutoff in the theory. In weak coupling, i.e., $\Delta \ll \omega_D \ll \mu$, the integral in the gap equation is dominated near $p = p_0$ and one can employ the trick of constant density of state.

In the BCS phase, all fermionic excitations are gapped, thus the gap equation can be reduced to

$$\int_0^{\omega_D} \frac{d\xi}{\sqrt{\xi^2 + \Delta_0^2}} = \frac{1}{g\rho_0} \quad (58)$$

of which the solution at weak coupling is

$$\Delta_0 \simeq 2\omega_D e^{-\frac{1}{g\rho_0}} \quad (59)$$

with the density of state $\rho_0 = \frac{mp_0}{2\pi^2}$ at $p = p_0$. Since all fermionic quasiparticles are gapped, we have $n_a = n_b = n/2$ with n the total density. The superfluid density reads

$$\rho_s = m_a n_a + m_b n_b = \frac{1}{2}(m_a + m_b)n, \quad (60)$$

which means all fermions participate the superfluid. The Meissner mass squared can be evaluated as

$$m_A^2 = e^2 \left(\frac{n_a}{m_a} Q_a^2 + \frac{n_b}{m_b} Q_b^2 \right) - e^2 \left(\frac{Q_a}{m_a} - \frac{Q_b}{m_b} \right)^2 \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2 \Delta^2}{12 \epsilon_\Delta^3}. \quad (61)$$

At weak coupling, we have approximately $n_a = n_b \simeq \frac{p_0^3}{6\pi^2}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2 \Delta^2}{12 \epsilon_\Delta^3} \\ &= \frac{p_0^3 \rho_0}{6} \int_0^{\omega_D} d\xi \frac{\Delta^2}{(\xi^2 + \Delta^2)^{3/2}} \simeq \frac{mp_0^3}{12\pi^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Hence we obtain

$$m_A^2 = \frac{ne^2(Q_a + Q_b)^2}{2(m_a + m_b)}. \quad (63)$$

Note that it only depends on $Q_a + Q_b$ and this conclusion is valid only at weak coupling we considered by hand.

In the breached pairing state with gapless fermionic excitations, the gap equation can be expressed as

$$\left(\int_{-\omega_D}^{\omega_D} - \int_{\xi_1}^{\xi_2} \right) \frac{d\xi}{\sqrt{\xi^2 + \Delta^2}} = \frac{2}{g\rho_0} \quad (64)$$

with $\xi_{1,2} = \frac{p_{1,2}^2}{2m} - \mu$. Using the equation for the BCS gap Δ_0 , the solution of the gap equation in the breached pairing state can be well described by[19]

$$\Delta = \sqrt{\Delta_0(2\Delta_c - \Delta_0)}. \quad (65)$$

The gap of breached pairing state can vary in the region $0 < \Delta < \Delta_0$ and the Fermi momenta difference can vary in the region

$$2\sqrt{m_a m_b} \Delta_0 < |p_a^2 - p_b^2| < 4\sqrt{m_a m_b} \Delta_0. \quad (66)$$

The number density of the two species are unequal. If we define the density asymmetry $\alpha = |n_a - n_b|/(n_a + n_b)$, then $\Delta = \Delta_0$ corresponds to $\alpha = 0$ and $\Delta = 0$ corresponds to the maximal asymmetry α_c . When α varies from 0 to α_c , the gap Δ decreases from Δ_0 to 0.

Firstly, we discuss the case $m_a = m_b$ where the superfluid density is proportional to the Meissner mass squared. In this case we have $\Delta_c = \delta\mu$ and $p^2/2m_c = 0$. Let us set $\delta\mu > 0$ without loss of generality, at zero temperature the superfluid density reads

$$\rho_s = mn - \frac{1}{6\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dp p^4 \delta(\epsilon_\Delta - \delta\mu). \quad (67)$$

In the weak coupling region, $\epsilon_\Delta - \delta\mu = 0$ has two possible roots p_1, p_2 and ρ_s can be evaluated as

$$\rho_s = mn \left[1 - \eta \frac{\delta\mu \Theta(\delta\mu - \Delta)}{\sqrt{\delta\mu^2 - \Delta^2}} \right] \quad (68)$$

with the coefficient $\eta = (p_1^3 + p_2^3) / (6\pi^2 n)$. At weak coupling, the coefficient η is approximately equal to 1 and ρ_s can be well approximated by

$$\rho_s \simeq mn \left[1 - \frac{\delta\mu \Theta(\delta\mu - \Delta)}{\sqrt{\delta\mu^2 - \Delta^2}} \right]. \quad (69)$$

It is very clear that in the BP state with $\Delta < \delta\mu$, ρ_s becomes negative and hence the BP state in weak coupling is unstable. We should emphasize that the function in the bracket is a universal one for gapless superfluids in equal mass systems. This function also appears in the Meissner mass squared for the 8th gluon in two flavor gapless color superconductor[20, 21]. In addition, in some anisotropic states in equal mass systems such as the LOFF state[26, 35] and the BP state via p-wave pairing[40] a similar function also appears. In the LOFF state $\delta\mu$ is replaced by an angle dependent mismatch δ_θ [26, 35], and in the p-wave BP state the gap Δ is replaced by an anisotropic gap function $\Delta_{\mathbf{n}}$ [40].

For general case with $m_a \neq m_b$, without loss of generality we can set $m_a < m_b$. For convenience we define a mass ratio $\lambda = m_b/m_a$ and set $\lambda > 1$. When $\lambda \neq 1$, the results for $p_a < p_b$ and $p_a > p_b$ (or $n_a < n_b$ and $n_a > n_b$) will be in principle different. We shall discuss these two cases separately at zero temperature in the following. For the sake of simplicity, we set $Q_a = Q_b = 1$. For general case, the result of the Meissner mass squared is valid if we replace the mass ratio λ by $\lambda' = (\frac{Q_a}{m_a})/(\frac{Q_b}{m_b})$.

A. $p_a < p_b$ (or $n_a < n_b$)

In this case, B branch becomes gapless and we have $n_a(\vec{p}) = 0, n_b(\vec{p}) = 1$ in the region $p_1 < p < p_2$. At zero temperature, the superfluid density in the BP state can be evaluated as

$$\rho_s = m_a \frac{\alpha_s p_1^3 + \beta_s p_2^3}{6\pi^2} \quad (70)$$

with the coefficients α_s and β_s defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_s &= 1 - \frac{\lambda}{|1 - (\lambda + 1)v_1^2|} - 3(\lambda + 1) \int_0^{p_1} \frac{dp p^2}{p_1^3} u_p^2, \\ \beta_s &= \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{|1 - (\lambda + 1)v_2^2|} + 3(\lambda + 1) \int_{p_2}^\infty \frac{dp p^2}{p_2^3} v_p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Here v_1^2 and v_2^2 are the values of v_p^2 at $p = p_1$ and $p = p_2$ respectively. Meanwhile the Meissner mass squared in the BP state can be evaluated as

$$m_A^2 = \frac{e^2}{m_b} \frac{\alpha_m p_1^3 + \beta_m p_2^3 - \gamma_m p_0^3}{6\pi^2} \quad (72)$$

where the coefficients α_m, β_m and γ_m are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_m &= \lambda - \frac{[1 + (\lambda - 1)v_1^2]^2}{|1 - (\lambda + 1)v_1^2|} - 3(\lambda + 1) \int_0^{p_1} \frac{dpp^2}{p_1^3} u_p^2, \\ \beta_m &= 1 - \frac{[1 + (\lambda - 1)v_2^2]^2}{|1 - (\lambda + 1)v_2^2|} + 3(\lambda + 1) \int_{p_2}^\infty \frac{dpp^2}{p_2^3} v_p^2, \\ \gamma_m &= \frac{(\lambda - 1)^2}{2(\lambda + 1)} \left[2 - \int_{\xi_1}^{\xi_2} d\xi \frac{\Delta^2}{(\xi^2 + \Delta^2)^{3/2}} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (73)$$

Since $p_a < p_b$, we have $\lambda\mu_b > \mu_a$, and then the chemical potentials in the BP states satisfy

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{2} < \frac{\lambda\mu_b - \mu_a}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} < \Delta_0. \quad (74)$$

Without loss of generality, we can keep μ_b fixed. After a simple algebra we find that

$$\lambda\mu_b - 2\sqrt{\lambda}\Delta_0 < \mu_a < \lambda\mu_b - \sqrt{\lambda}\Delta_0. \quad (75)$$

The lower bound corresponds to $\Delta = \Delta_0$ where $\alpha = 0$, and the upper bound corresponds to $\Delta = 0$ where $\alpha = \alpha_c$. Then we can calculate the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared as functions of Δ/Δ_0 in the range $0 < \Delta/\Delta_0 < 1$ which is just the room of BP state. For some reason which will be seen clearly in the next section, we calculate the following scaled dimensionless quantities

$$F_s = \frac{\rho_s}{m_b p_b^3}, \quad F_A = \frac{(m_a + m_b)^2}{4m_b p_b^3} \frac{m_A^2}{e^2}. \quad (76)$$

When $m_a = m_b$, we have $F_s = F_A$. The numerical results are shown in Fig.1. We find that the superfluid density is always negative no matter how large the mass ratio is. However, the Meissner mass squared is positive in a region $0 < \Delta/\Delta_0 < \nu$ with $\nu < 1$. When the mass ratio becomes very large, such as $\lambda = 100$, ν is very close to 1. Even though there exists a big room where the Meissner mass squared is positive, both the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared tend to negative infinity near $\Delta/\Delta_0 = 1$. Such a divergence at the BP-BCS transition point, which comes from the divergent density of state of the gapless excitations, can not be avoided[17, 34].

B. $p_a > p_b$ (or $n_a > n_b$)

In this case, A branch becomes gapless and we have $n_a(\vec{p}) = 1, n_b(\vec{p}) = 0$ in the region $p_1 < p < p_2$. At zero temperature, the superfluid density in the BP state takes the same form

$$\rho_s = m_a \frac{\alpha_s p_1^3 + \beta_s p_2^3}{6\pi^2}, \quad (77)$$

where the coefficients α_s and β_s are modified to

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_s &= \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{|\lambda - (\lambda + 1)v_1^2|} - 3(\lambda + 1) \int_0^{p_1} \frac{dpp^2}{p_1^3} u_p^2, \\ \beta_s &= 1 - \frac{\lambda}{|\lambda - (\lambda + 1)v_2^2|} + 3(\lambda + 1) \int_{p_2}^\infty \frac{dpp^2}{p_2^3} v_p^2.\end{aligned}\quad (78)$$




FIG. 1: The scaled Meissner mass squared F_A and superfluid density F_s as functions of Δ/Δ_0 in the case $p_a < p_b$. The BCS gap Δ_0 is chosen to be $\Delta_0 = 0.01\mu_b$. For other choices which are in weak coupling region, the results are almost the same.

The Meissner mass squared also takes the same form

$$m_A^2 = \frac{e^2}{m_b} \frac{\alpha_m p_1^3 + \beta_m p_2^3 - \gamma_m p_0^3}{6\pi^2} \quad (79)$$

where the coefficients α_m, β_m are modified to

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_m &= 1 - \frac{[\lambda - (\lambda - 1)v_1^2]^2}{|\lambda - (\lambda + 1)v_1^2|} - 3(\lambda + 1) \int_0^{p_1} \frac{dpp^2}{p_1^3} u_p^2, \\ \beta_m &= \lambda - \frac{[\lambda - (\lambda - 1)v_2^2]^2}{|\lambda - (\lambda + 1)v_2^2|} + 3(\lambda + 1) \int_{p_2}^\infty \frac{dpp^2}{p_2^3} v_p^2,\end{aligned}\quad (80)$$




FIG. 2: The scaled Meissner mass squared F_A and superfluid density F_s as functions of Δ/Δ_0 in the case $p_a > p_b$. The BCS gap Δ_0 is chosen to be $\Delta_0 = 0.01\mu_b$. For other choices which are in weak coupling region, the results are almost the same.

while γ_m remains unchanged.

Similarly, keeping μ_b fixed, in the BP states we have

$$\lambda\mu_b + \sqrt{\lambda}\Delta_0 < \mu_a < \lambda\mu_b + 2\sqrt{\lambda}\Delta_0. \quad (81)$$

The lower bound corresponds to $\Delta = 0$ where $\alpha = \alpha_c$, while the upper bound corresponds to $\Delta = \Delta_0$ where $\alpha = 0$. The superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared are calculated in Fig.2 as functions of Δ/Δ_0 in the range $0 < \Delta/\Delta_0 < 1$. The qualitative behavior is almost the same as the case $p_a < p_b$.

In summary, we have shown that in weak coupling, the superfluid density of the BP state is always nega-

tive, while the Meissner mass squared can be positive in a wide region. When the mass ratio becomes very large, the region with positive Meissner mass squared becomes almost the whole room of BP states, however, the divergence at the BP-BCS transition point can never be avoided. So at large mass ratio, the BP state can be free from magnetic instability, however, it suffers the negative superfluid density. In fact, the conclusion will also be valid at stronger coupling, if there exist two gapless nodes[16].

VI. THE LOFF STATE

We have calculated the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared in the breached pairing state. The superfluid density is always negative, which means the BP state is energetically unfavored. Such an instability indicates that the ground state should not be a homogeneous and isotropic state, but some isotropic states which breaks rotational symmetry. We shall show in the following that the negative superfluid density directly means that the LOFF state is energetically favored.

For the sake of simplicity, we only consider the simplest pattern of LOFF state, i.e., the single plane wave ansatz

$$\langle \phi(x) \rangle = \Delta e^{2i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}}, \quad \langle \phi^*(x) \rangle = \Delta e^{-2i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}}. \quad (82)$$

Here Δ is a real quantity, and $2\vec{q}$ is the so called LOFF momentum. To evaluate the thermodynamic potential of the LOFF state, we often define new fermion fields $\chi_a(x) = e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}}\psi_a(x)$ and $\chi_b(x) = e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}}\psi_b(x)$, and then we can directly evaluate the Gaussian path integral in the new basis χ_a, χ_b . Following this way, the thermodynamic potential reads

$$\Omega = \frac{\Delta^2}{g} - T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}_q^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \quad (83)$$

in terms of the new inverse propagator

$$\mathcal{G}^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega_n - \epsilon_{\vec{p}+\vec{q}}^a & \Delta \\ \Delta & i\omega_n + \epsilon_{\vec{p}-\vec{q}}^b \end{pmatrix}. \quad (84)$$

This is just the $(\vec{q} + \vec{p}, \vec{q} - \vec{p})$ picture of the LOFF state, which means the fermions in the cooper pair move together with a total momentum $2\vec{q}$. However, we will show in the following that this is not the energetically favored momentum configuration in unequal mass systems. In fact, we can do any transformation like

$$\chi_a(x) = e^{i\vec{q}_a\cdot\vec{x}}\psi_a(x), \quad \chi_b(x) = e^{i\vec{q}_b\cdot\vec{x}}\psi_b(x) \quad (85)$$

satisfying $\vec{q}_a + \vec{q}_b = 2\vec{q}$ to evaluate the effective potential, since the phase factor in the condensate can be eliminated by any \vec{q}_a and \vec{q}_b satisfying $\vec{q}_a + \vec{q}_b = 2\vec{q}$. For a general transformation, the thermodynamic potential reads

$$\Omega = \frac{\Delta^2}{g} - T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}_{q_a, q_b}^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \quad (86)$$

with

$$\mathcal{G}_{q_a, q_b}^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega_n - \epsilon_{\vec{p}+\vec{q}_a}^a & \Delta \\ \Delta & i\omega_n + \epsilon_{\vec{p}-\vec{q}_b}^b \end{pmatrix}. \quad (87)$$

This arbitrariness of phase transformation directly links to the fact that the symmetry group of the model Lagrangian is $U(1)_{\varphi_a} \otimes U(1)_{\varphi_b}$.

Without loss of generality, we can introduce a LOFF velocity \vec{w} such that

$$\vec{q}_a = m_1 \vec{w}, \quad \vec{q}_b = m_2 \vec{w} \quad (88)$$

satisfying $m_1 + m_2 = m_a + m_b$. With a suitable choice of coordinates such that $\vec{w} = (0, 0, w)$, we can do the Ginzburg-Landau like expansion

$$\Omega(w) - \Omega(0) = \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial w} \Big|_{w=0} w + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \Omega}{\partial w^2} \Big|_{w=0} w^2 + \dots \quad (89)$$

The coefficient of the linear term vanishes automatically since $w = 0$ must be a solution of the gap equation for w . Since the thermodynamic potential in the BP state with $w = 0$ is fixed, the coefficient of w^2 determines which choice is energetically favored. Defining $\kappa_w = \frac{\partial^2 \Omega}{\partial w^2} \Big|_{w=0}$, we observe that

$$\kappa_w = C_0 F_s \quad (90)$$

for the case $\vec{q}_i = m_i \vec{w}$ and

$$\kappa_w = C_0 F_A \quad (91)$$

for the case $\vec{q}_a = \vec{q}_b = \vec{q}$, where $C_0 = m_b p_b^3$ is a constant. In section IV, we have numerically shown that

$$F_s < F_A. \quad (92)$$

Especially, there exists a wide region where F_A is positive but F_s is negative. Numerically we have checked that for all choice, κ_w is always negative only when $m_1 = m_a, m_2 = m_b$. This intuitive argument indicates that the energetically favored momentum configuration of LOFF state is $\vec{q}_a = m_a \vec{w}, \vec{q}_b = m_b \vec{w}$. This is nothing but the state with spontaneous generated superflow \vec{v}_s if we identify $\vec{w} = \vec{v}_s$. In fact, it is quite easy for us to understand. The physical picture of the LOFF state is that the fermions in a cooper pair move together with a nonzero momentum, and hence they should possess a same velocity, not momentum.

Once this is done, we can evaluate the effective potential as

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(\Delta, w) = & \frac{\Delta^2}{g} - \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\left(\frac{\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^A}{2} + T \ln(1 + e^{-\frac{\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^A}{T}}) \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^B}{2} + T \ln(1 + e^{-\frac{\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^B}{T}}) \right) - \tilde{\epsilon}_S \right], \quad (93) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_S = p^2/2m - \tilde{\mu}$ and $\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^A, \epsilon_{\vec{p}}^B$ are the energies of the quasiparticles

$$\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^{A,B} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - \tilde{\mu} \right)^2 + \Delta^2} \pm \left(\frac{p^2}{2m_c} + \tilde{\delta} + \vec{p} \cdot \vec{w} \right) \quad (94)$$

with $\tilde{\mu} = \mu - (m_a + m_b)w^2/4$ and $\tilde{\delta} = \delta\mu + (m_a - m_b)w^2/4$. In fact, this momentum configuration is the most convenient one for us to calculate the LOFF solution, since the anisotropic term $\vec{p} \cdot \vec{w}$ only appears in the asymmetric part. Assuming the pairing interaction is restricted in the region $p_0 - \Lambda < |\vec{p}| < p_0 + \Lambda$ with $\Lambda \ll p_0$ as the investigations in the former sections, in weak coupling we can safely neglect the terms of order w^2 and do the following replacement

$$\vec{p} \cdot \vec{w} \rightarrow p_0 w \cos \theta, \quad \frac{p^2}{2m_c} \rightarrow \frac{p_0^2}{2m_c}. \quad (95)$$

Here θ is angle between \vec{p} and \vec{w} . Up to now, all things become the same as the equal mass systems[4, 26] and the conclusions in equal mass systems can be directly applied. In the grand canonical ensemble with fixed chemical potentials, the corresponding LOFF window is

$$0.707\Delta_0 < \left| \delta\mu + \frac{p_0^2}{2m_c} \right| < 0.754\Delta_0, \quad (96)$$

where Δ_0 is the BCS gap, and the LOFF velocity w is approximately[4, 26]

$$p_0 w \simeq 1.2 \left| \delta\mu + \frac{p_0^2}{2m_c} \right|. \quad (97)$$

Defining the mass asymmetry $\epsilon = \frac{m_b - m_a}{m_b + m_a}$ we find

$$\delta\mu + \frac{p_0^2}{2m_c} = \frac{1}{2} [(1 + \epsilon)\mu_b - (1 - \epsilon)\mu_a] \equiv \delta(\epsilon), \quad (98)$$

we can reexpress the LOFF window as the conventional form in equal mass case

$$0.707\Delta_0 < |\delta(\epsilon)| < 0.754\Delta_0 \quad (99)$$

and $p_0 w \simeq 1.2|\delta(\epsilon)|$. In fact, due to the relation

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \frac{|p_b^2 - p_a^2|}{2(m_a + m_b)}, \quad (100)$$

the size of the LOFF momentum is

$$|2\vec{q}| = (m_a + m_b)w = 1.2 \frac{|p_b^2 - p_a^2|}{2p_0} \simeq 1.2|p_b - p_a|, \quad (101)$$

which is just we expect. A LOFF state induced by a pure mass difference is of great interest since in some physical systems the chemical potentials are always equal due to chemical equilibrium. Setting $\mu_a = \mu_b \equiv \mu$ we obtain the mass difference window

$$0.707 \frac{\Delta_0}{\mu} < |\epsilon| < 0.754 \frac{\Delta_0}{\mu}. \quad (102)$$

For weak coupling, $\Delta_0 \ll \mu$, the LOFF state can exist only when the mass asymmetry is very small. For canonical ensemble where the particle number densities n_a and n_b are fixed, the LOFF window will be larger, which is

similar to the equal mass system[35, 36]. Such a situation can be realized in cold fermi gas systems a mixture of ^6Li and ^{40}K .

Finally, we can calculate the superfluid density tensor and the Meissner mass squared tensor in the LOFF state. Since the rotational symmetry $O(3)$ is broken down to $O(2)$, the superfluid density and Meissner mass squared become tensors ρ_{ij} and $(m_A^2)_{ij}$. We can decompose them into a transverse and a longitudinal part due to the residue symmetry $O(2)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{ij} &= \rho_T(\delta_{ij} - \hat{w}_i \hat{w}_j) + \rho_L \hat{w}_i \hat{w}_j, \\ (m_A^2)_{ij} &= m_T^2(\delta_{ij} - \hat{w}_i \hat{w}_j) + m_L^2 \hat{w}_i \hat{w}_j\end{aligned}\quad (103)$$

with $\hat{w} \equiv \vec{w}/|\vec{w}|$. The transverse and longitudinal superfluid density read

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_T &= m_a n_a + m_b n_b + \frac{3}{4} \int_{-1}^1 d \cos \theta \sin^2 \theta F(\cos \theta) \quad , \\ \rho_L &= m_a n_a + m_b n_b - \frac{3}{2} \int_{-1}^1 d \cos \theta \cos^2 \theta F(\cos \theta)\end{aligned}\quad (104)$$

with the function $F(\cos \theta)$ defined as

$$F(\cos \theta) = \int_0^\infty \frac{p^4 dp}{4\pi^2} [f'(\epsilon_p^A) + f'(\epsilon_p^B)] \quad (105)$$

While the transverse and longitudinal Meissner mass squared read

$$\begin{aligned}m_T^2 &= e^2 \left(\frac{n_a}{m_a} + \frac{n_b}{m_b} \right) + \frac{3e^2}{4} \int_{-1}^1 d \cos \theta \sin^2 \theta G(\cos \theta), \\ m_L^2 &= e^2 \left(\frac{n_a}{m_a} + \frac{n_b}{m_b} \right) + \frac{3e^2}{2} \int_{-1}^1 d \cos \theta \cos^2 \theta G(\cos \theta)\end{aligned}\quad (106)$$

with the function $G(\cos \theta)$ defined as

$$G(\cos \theta) = \int_0^\infty \frac{p^4 dp}{4\pi^2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{m_a} - \frac{1}{m_b} \right)^2 u_p^2 v_p^2 \frac{f(\epsilon_p^A) + f(\epsilon_p^B) - 1}{\epsilon_\Delta} + \left(\frac{u_p^2}{m_a} + \frac{v_p^2}{m_b} \right)^2 f'(\epsilon_p^A) + \left(\frac{v_p^2}{m_a} + \frac{u_p^2}{m_b} \right)^2 f'(\epsilon_p^B) \right] \quad (107)$$

In the equal mass systems, we have $m_T^2 \propto \rho_T$ and one can prove they are both zero[26], which means there are no transverse Meissner effect and superfluid density. The reason is that the formula of the transverse Meissner mass squared is just the left hand side of the gap equation for the LOFF momentum(right hand side is zero, see[4, 26]). However, for unequal mass systems, the gap equation seems the same as equal mass systems, but the formula of Meissner mass squared becomes quite different, hence there will be both transverse and longitudinal Meissner effect.

VII. EXTENSION TO FINITE RANGE INTERACTION

The formulae for the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared we have derived are based on a point interaction model. In real world, the interactions are finite range in many systems. In this section we shall show that the formula we have derived can be directly applied to finite range interaction systems, if we replace the momentum independent gap Δ by a momentum-dependent gap function $\Delta(\vec{p})$.

With a finite range interaction, the Lagrangian can be

written as

$$\begin{aligned}L &= \int d^3 \vec{x} \psi_i^*(\vec{x}, \tau) \left[-\partial_\tau + \frac{\nabla^2}{2m_i} + \mu_i \right] \psi_i(\vec{x}, \tau) \\ &+ \int d^3 \vec{x} d^3 \vec{y} \psi_a^*(\vec{x}) \psi_b^*(\vec{y}) V(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \psi_b(\vec{y}) \psi_a(\vec{x}).\end{aligned}\quad (108)$$

Here we have assumed the interaction is static. For convenience we define the following condensates

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) &= \langle \psi_b(\vec{y}) \psi_a(\vec{x}) \rangle, \\ \Phi^*(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) &= \langle \psi_a^*(\vec{x}) \psi_b^*(\vec{y}) \rangle\end{aligned}\quad (109)$$

and the gap functions

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) &= V(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \langle \psi_b(\vec{y}) \psi_a(\vec{x}) \rangle, \\ \Delta^*(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) &= V(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \langle \psi_a^*(\vec{x}) \psi_b^*(\vec{y}) \rangle.\end{aligned}\quad (110)$$

If the system is translational invariant and $V(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = V(\vec{x} - \vec{y})$, then Φ, Δ and their complex conjugates only depends on $\vec{x} - \vec{y}$. In mean field approximation the thermodynamic potential can be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega &= -T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \ln \mathcal{G}^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) \\ &+ \int \frac{d^3 \vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3 \vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3} \Phi(\vec{p}) \Phi^*(\vec{q}) V(\vec{p} - \vec{q})\end{aligned}\quad (111)$$

in terms of the inverse fermion propagator

$$\mathcal{G}^{-1}(i\omega_n, \vec{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega_n - \epsilon_{\vec{p}}^a & \Delta(\vec{p}) \\ \Delta^*(\vec{p}) & i\omega_n + \epsilon_{\vec{p}}^b \end{pmatrix} \quad (112)$$

Here $V(\vec{p})$, $\Phi(\vec{p})$ and $\Delta(\vec{p})$ are Fourier transformation of $V(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$, $\Phi(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$ and $\Delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$. Up to now, all things are similar to the point interaction model. Since the derivation of the superfluid density and Meissner mass squared only depends on the fermion propagator \mathcal{G} , we conclude that the formulae of superfluid density and Meissner mass squared valid in the finite range interaction models, if we replace the momentum-independent gap Δ by the momentum-dependent gap function $\Delta(\vec{p})$.

The BP state with zero range interaction suffers negative superfluid density, and hence is ruled out. Soon it was proposed that the BP state will be stable in a finite range interaction model with large mass ratio[12]. However, in Ref[12], the authors only showed that such stable BP state is the global minimum of the thermodynamic potential Ω with fixed chemical potentials. For a complete study, other stability such as the superfluid density should be checked. In this section, we shall focus on this issue. Here we suppose the interaction potential is spherically symmetric so that the gap function $\Delta(\vec{p})$ only depends on $p = |\vec{p}|$. With a finite range interaction, an analytical result for the gap function Δ_p is generally impossible. Here we only give a qualitative discussion. A detailed numerical calculation is deferred to be a future work.

With a spherically symmetric potential $V(r)$, the gap function Δ_p satisfies the following integral equation

$$\Delta_q = \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} V(|\vec{q}-\vec{p}|) \frac{\Theta(\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^A) - \Theta(-\epsilon_{\vec{p}}^B)}{2\sqrt{\left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - \mu\right)^2 + \Delta_p^2}} \Delta_p. \quad (113)$$

For a given potential V and Fermi surface mismatch, we can solve the above equation and obtain all possible solutions, and then determine the ground state which has the lowest thermodynamic potential. Once the BP solution is obtained, we can calculate the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared. All calculation procedure remains unchanged, if we take the momentum dependence of the gap function into account. In fact, this is a very important difference from the point interaction model, which may produce a real stable BP state with positive superfluid density.

For simplicity, let us concentrate on the superfluid density and only consider the case $p_b > p_a$. The superfluid density can be evaluated as

$$\rho_s = m_a \frac{\alpha_s p_1^3 + \beta_s p_2^3}{6\pi^2} \quad (114)$$

with the coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_s &= 1 - \frac{\lambda}{|g(p_1) - (\lambda+1)v_1^2|} - 3(\lambda+1) \int_0^{p_1} \frac{dpp^2}{p_1^3} u_p^2, \\ \beta_s &= \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{|g(p_2) - (\lambda+1)v_2^2|} + 3(\lambda+1) \int_{p_2}^{\infty} \frac{dpp^2}{p_2^3} v_p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

The difference to the point interaction model is the function $g(p)$ defined as

$$g(p) = 1 + \frac{m_b}{p} \frac{\Delta_p \Delta'_p}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{p^2}{2m} - \mu\right)^2 + \Delta_p^2}} \quad (116)$$

with $\Delta'_p = \frac{d\Delta_p}{dp}$. For the point interaction model, we have $\Delta'_p = 0$ automatically and hence $g(p) \equiv 1$, which produces negative superfluid density as we have shown. In principle, with a proper momentum structure of the gap function, we can obtain a positive superfluid density. In fact, we can firstly design a proper momentum structure of the gap function Δ_p which can produce a BP state with positive superfluid density, and then use the integral equation for Δ_p to obtain the interaction potential numerically. For most cases, the gap function peaks about $p = p_0$ and drops down fast when $p > p_0$. Generally we have $g(p) = 1$ and $v_p^2 = 0$ when $p \geq p_2$ [12]. Then $\beta_s = 0$ and the sign of the superfluid density depends only on α_s . So to produce a BP state with positive superfluid density, we require

$$|g(p_1) - (\lambda+1)v_1^2| > \frac{\lambda}{1 - 3(\lambda+1)p_1^{-3} \int_0^{p_1} dpp^2 u_p^2} \quad (117)$$

If the above condition is satisfied, we then obtain a really stable BP state. Especially, if the slope of the gap function at $p = p_1$ is very large, a positive superfluid density and hence a stable BP state can be easily obtained.

Finally, we discuss the cutoff interaction studied in Ref[12]. In this case, the momentum structure of the gap function is $\Delta_p = \Delta$ for $p < p_\Lambda$ and $\Delta_p = 0$ for $p > p_\Lambda$, we have $g(p) \equiv 1$ for all p except $p = p_\Lambda$. Generally, $p_{1,2} \neq p_\Lambda$, hence the situation is just the same as the point interaction model, i.e., we will obtain a negative superfluid density. However, one can not treat such a cutoff interaction seriously since the gap function do not really jump at a cutoff p_Λ in real world.

VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have derived the superfluid density and the Meissner mass squared for fermion cooper pairing with unequal masses via a standard field theory approach. For equal mass systems, they are indeed proportional to each other, as we learn from the text books. However, for unequal mass systems, they are generally different. In the breached pairing states with zero range interaction, the

superfluid density is always negative, but the Meissner mass squared can be mostly positive. As a consequence, the momentum configuration of the LOFF state should be correctly established. The energetically favored LOFF configuration in unequal mass system is physically equivalent to a spontaneous generated superflow. Note that, this conclusions are only valid at weak coupling we considered in this paper. Whether they are valid at strong coupling in the BCS-BEC crossover should be examined. Generally, with a large mass difference, we expect a stable BP state at strong coupling will be more easy to be realized than the equal mass system[13]. We defer this issue to be a future work[42].

There are some troubles due to the arbitrariness in the phase transformation induced by the $U(1)_{\varphi_a} \otimes U(1)_{\varphi_b}$ symmetry. To investigate the Goldstone mode in the superfluid state at low temperature, we often neglect the fluctuation of the amplitude of the order parameter and write $\phi(x) = \Delta e^{2i\theta(x)}$. Then using the standard phase transformation

$$\psi_i(x) = \tilde{\psi}_i(x)e^{i\theta(x)}, \quad \psi_i^*(x) = \tilde{\psi}_i^*(x)e^{-i\theta(x)} \quad (118)$$

we can obtain the effective action for the Goldstone boson. However, generally we can transform the fermion fields as follows,

$$\psi_i(x) = \tilde{\psi}_i(x)e^{i\nu_i\theta(x)}, \quad \psi_i^*(x) = \tilde{\psi}_i^*(x)e^{-i\nu_i\theta(x)}. \quad (119)$$

Here ν_a and ν_b are arbitrary constants satisfying the constraint $\nu_a + \nu_b = 2$. After some direct calculation, we can obtain the effective action at low energy limit

$$S_{eff}[\theta] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k [D\nu_m^2 + \mathcal{P}\vec{q}^2] |\theta(q)|^2. \quad (120)$$

If all fermionic excitations are gapped, \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{P} can be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Delta^2}{\epsilon_\Delta^3}, \\ \mathcal{P} &= \frac{n_a}{m_a} \nu_a^2 + \frac{n_b}{m_b} \nu_b^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{\nu_a}{m_a} - \frac{\nu_b}{m_b} \right)^2 \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\vec{p}^2 \Delta^2}{12 \epsilon_\Delta^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

Only at weak coupling limit, these quantities are independent of ν_a and ν_b . Hence the result of Goldstone boson velocity in [41] is safe. Note that this problem also arises in equal mass systems. This trouble may imply that we can not neglect the fluctuation of the amplitude of the order parameter at strong coupling. In addition, when there exist gapless fermionic excitations such as in the BP and LOFF state, the problem also appears.

Due to this observation, we have a comment on the stability condition for asymmetric fermion superfluids. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the case $m_a = m_b = m$. The superfluid density ρ_s is often regarded as a stability condition[13]. When the superfluid density is negative, it directly means that the LOFF state has lower free energy than BP state. However, the superfluid density only corresponds to the standard LOFF state with $\vec{q}_a = \vec{q}_b$. Let us relax the definition of LOFF state as we discussed in Section VII. For general case, we can set $\vec{q}_a = \nu_a \vec{q}$ and $\vec{q}_b = \nu_b \vec{q}$ with $\nu_a + \nu_b = 2$. For a complete analysis of stability, we should check $\kappa_q = \frac{\partial^2 \Omega}{\partial q^2}|_{q=0}$ is positive for all possible ν_a and ν_b . For $\nu_a = \nu_b = 1$, $\kappa_q \propto \rho_s$. It has been found that ρ_s is negative at weak coupling but positive at strong coupling[13]. Even though ρ_s is positive at strong coupling which means BP state becomes stable against the standard LOFF state with $\vec{q}_a = \vec{q}_b$, however, there is no direct observation that κ_q is positive for any ν_a and ν_b , such as $\nu_a = 2, \nu_b = 0$. If κ_q is negative for $\nu_a \neq \nu_b$, a non-standard LOFF state with $\vec{q}_a \neq \vec{q}_b$ is energetically favored at strong coupling.

Acknowledgement: We thank H.Ren, W.V.Liu, M.M.Forbes, H.Caldas, M.Huang and H.Zhai for helpful discussions. The work was supported in part by the grants NSFC10428510, 10435080, 10447122, 10575058 and SRFDP20040003103.

-
- [1] G.Sarma, J.Phys.Chem.Solid **24**,1029(1963).
 - [2] A.I.Larkin and Yu.N.Ovchinnikov, Sov.Phys. JETP **20**(1965).
 - [3] P.Fulde and R.A.Ferrell, Phys. Rev **A135**,550(1964).
 - [4] S.Takada and T.Izuyama, Prog.Theor.Phys.**41**,635(1969).
 - [5] M.W.Zwierlein, A.Schirotzek, C.H.Schunck and W.Ketterle, Science **311**(5760), 492(2006); cond-mat/0511197.
 - [6] G.B.Partridge, W.Li, R.I.Kamar, Y.Liao and R.G.Hulet, Science, 23 December 2005 (10.1126/science.1122876);

- cond-mat/0511752.
- [7] A.Sedrakian and U.Lombardo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 602(2000).
- [8] M.Huang, P.Zhuang, and W.Chao, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 065015(2003).
- [9] I.Shovkovy and M.Huang, Phys. Lett. **B564** 205(2003).
- [10] M.Huang and I.Shovkovy, Nucl. Phys. **A729**, 835(2003).
- [11] W.V.Liu and F.Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett.**90**, 047002(2003).
- [12] M.M.Forbes, E.Gubankova, W. Vincent Liu, F.Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett.**94**, 017001(2005).

- [13] C.H.Pao, S.Wu and S.K.Yip, cond-mat/0506437.
- [14] D.T.Son and M.A.Stephanov, cond-mat/0507586.
- [15] M.Kitazawa, D.Rischke and A.Shovkovy, hep-ph/0602065.
- [16] E.Gubankova, A.Schmitt and F.Wilczek, cond-mat/0603603.
- [17] S.T.Wu and S.Yip, Phys.Rev. **A67**, 053603(2003) ,
- [18] P.F.Bedaque, H.Caldas and G.Rupak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 247002(2003).
- [19] H.Caldas, Phys. Rev. **A69**, 063602(2004).
- [20] M.Huang and I.Shovkovy, Phys.Rev. **D70**, R051501(2004).
- [21] M.Huang and I.Shovkovy, Phys.Rev. **D70**, 094030(2004).
- [22] R.Casalbuoni, R.Gatto, M.Mannarelli, G.Nardulli and M.Ruggieri, Phys.Lett. **B605** 362(2005).
- [23] M.Alford, Q.Wang, J.Phys. **G31** 719(2005).
- [24] K.Fukushima, hep-ph/0506080.
- [25] I.Giannakis and H.Ren, Phys. Lett. **B611**, 137(2005).
- [26] I.Giannakis and H.Ren, Nucl. Phys. **B723**, 255(2005).
- [27] I.Giannakis, D.Hou and H.Ren, Phys.Lett. **B631** 16(2005).
- [28] M.Huang, Phys.Rev. **D73**, 045007(2006).
- [29] D.Hong, hep-ph/0506097.
- [30] E.V.Gorbar, M.Hashimoto and V.A.Miransky, Phys.Lett. **B632**, 305(2006).
- [31] E.V.Gorbar, M.Hashimoto and V.A.Miransky, Phys.Rev.Lett. **96**, 022005 (2006).
- [32] See, for instance, A.L.Fetter and J.D. Walecka, Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems, McGraw-Hill, INC. 1971.
- [33] Naoto Nagaosa, Quantum Field Theory in Condensed Matter Physics(Springer, Heidelberg, Germany, 1999).
- [34] L.He, M.Jin and P.Zhuang, Phys.Rev. **B73**, 024511(2005).
- [35] L.He, M.Jin and P.Zhuang, cond-mat/0601147.
- [36] Hui Hu and Xia-Ji Liu, cond-mat/0603332.
- [37] K.Iida and G.Baym, Phys.Rev.**D65**, 014022(2002); Phys.Rev.**D66**, 014015(2002).
- [38] W.V.Liu and F.Wilczek, cond-mat/0304632.
- [39] S.T.Wu and S.Yip, cond-mat/0305675.
- [40] E.Gubankova, E.G.Mishchenko and F.Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**,110402(2005); cond-mat/0411238.
- [41] L.He, M.Jin and P.Zhuang, cond-mat/0603683.
- [42] L.He, M.Jin and P.Zhuang, in progress.