



HAL
open science

The third virial coefficient of a two-component unitary Fermi gas across an Efimov-effect threshold

Chao Gao, Shimpei Endo, Yvan Castin

► **To cite this version:**

Chao Gao, Shimpei Endo, Yvan Castin. The third virial coefficient of a two-component unitary Fermi gas across an Efimov-effect threshold. 2014. hal-01078973v1

HAL Id: hal-01078973

<https://hal.science/hal-01078973v1>

Preprint submitted on 30 Oct 2014 (v1), last revised 10 Apr 2015 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The third virial coefficient of a two-component unitary Fermi gas across an Efimov-effect threshold

CHAO GAO*, SHIMPEI ENDO AND YVAN CASTIN

**Institute for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China*

Laboratoire Kastler Brossel, École Normale Supérieure, CNRS, UPMC, 24 rue Lhomond, 75231 Paris, France

PACS 67.85.d – Ultracold gases, trapped gases.

Abstract. - We consider a mixture of two single-spin-state fermions with an interaction of negligible range and infinite s -wave scattering length. By varying the mass ratio α across $\alpha_c \simeq 13.6069$ one can switch on-and-off the Efimov effect. We determine analytically the third cluster coefficient of the gas. We show that it is a smooth function of α across α_c since, unexpectedly, the three-body parameter characterizing the interaction is relevant even on the non-efimovian side $\alpha < \alpha_c$.

Introduction. – A powerful theory tool in the statistical physics of interacting quantum systems is the so-called cluster or virial expansion, where the thermodynamic potentials are expanded in powers of the small degeneracy parameter [1]. Whereas the second cluster coefficient b_2 has a known general expression since the 1930s [2], it is a long-lasting challenge to determine the third cluster coefficient b_3 explicitly. Starting from the late 1950s, analytical results for b_3 have been obtained for the two-body hard-core model, the archetype of non-resonant interactions where the s -wave scattering length a is at most of the order of the interaction range, in the form of expansions in powers of a small parameter λ/a [3] or a/λ [4], where λ is the thermal de Broglie wavelength.

Interest in b_3 was reactivated by a recent experimental breakthrough with ultracold atoms: long-lived spin 1/2 Fermi gases can be prepared in the resonantly interacting regime, that is with $|a|$ much larger than the interaction range, thanks to magnetic Feshbach resonances [5]. This triggered numerical calculation of b_3 in the maximally interacting, unitary limit ($1/a = 0$), with the harmonic regulator technique of [6] as done in [7], or with diagrammatic techniques [8]. Due to scaling invariance in the unitary limit, b_3 is just a number, and through a precise measurement of the equation of state of the gas [9,10], its predicted value was confirmed [10].

Physics is richer when the Efimov effect [11] sets in: the continuous scaling invariance is broken, there appears a length scale R_t characterizing the interaction, the three-body parameter, and there exists an infinite number of trimer states with an asymptotically geometric spectrum.

The third cluster coefficient b_3 becomes a function of temperature. In a spinless bosonic gas with zero-range interactions, it was determined analytically [12]. Within the three-body hard-core model that fixes R_t [13], Quantum Monte Carlo simulations have confirmed this analytical prediction and have shown that the third order cluster expansion can provide a good description of the gas phase down to the liquid-gas phase transition [14], thus exemplifying its usefulness.

The problem becomes even more intriguing when there exists a system parameter allowing to switch on-and-off the Efimov effect, as in the two-component Fermi gas with an adjustable mass ratio. For two identical fermions and a distinguishable particle, there is an Efimov effect if the mass ratio α of a fermion to the other particle exceeds $\alpha_c = 13.6069\dots$ [11,15]. Up to now, the calculation of b_3 is numerical and limited to $\alpha < \alpha_c$ [16]. Strikingly it predicts that b_3 has an infinite derivative at $\alpha = \alpha_c$. As b_3 is a coefficient in the grand potential Ω , this would imply a singular derivative of Ω as a function of α , i. e. a first order phase transition, subsisting at arbitrarily low phase space density, i. e. at temperatures T arbitrarily higher than the Fermi temperature T_F , contrarily to common expectations for phase transitions. The present work determines b_3 analytically and solves this paradox.

The cluster expansion. – We consider a mixture of two fully polarized fermionic species, with single particle masses m_1 and m_2 , with no intraspecies interaction and a purely s -wave interspecies interaction, of negligible range and infinite scattering length (unitary limit). At thermal equilibrium in a cubic box, the total pressure admits in

the thermodynamic limit the cluster expansion

$$\frac{P\lambda_r^3}{k_B T} = \sum_{(n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2} b_{n_1, n_2} z_1^{n_1} z_2^{n_2} \quad (1)$$

where z_i are fugacities $\exp(\beta\mu_i)$, $\lambda_r = [2\pi\hbar^2/(m_r k_B T)]^{1/2}$ is the thermal de Broglie wavelength associated to the reduced mass $m_r = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2)$ and temperature T , $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$, μ_i is the chemical potential of species i , and \mathbb{N} is the set of all non-negative integers.

To determine the cluster coefficients b_{n_1, n_2} one can use the harmonic regulator trick [6]: one rather assumes that the system is at thermal equilibrium in an isotropic harmonic trap, with the same trap frequency ω for the two species, and one considers the cluster expansion of $(-\Omega)/(k_B T Z_1)$ in powers of z_1 and z_2 , with Ω the grand potential and Z_1 the single particle partition function in the trap. When $\omega \rightarrow 0$, the corresponding coefficients have a limit B_{n_1, n_2} that one can relate to b_{n_1, n_2} [6, 7, 16]:

$$B_{n_1, n_2} = \left(\frac{m_r}{n_1 m_1 + n_2 m_2} \right)^{3/2} b_{n_1, n_2} \quad (2)$$

We study $B_{2,1}$ as a function of the mass ratio $\alpha = m_1/m_2$.

Case $\alpha < \alpha_c$: 0-parameter zero-range model. – The cluster coefficient $B_{2,1}$ can be deduced from the partition functions of up to three bodies in the trap, that is from the n -body energy spectra for $n \leq 3$. In the unitary limit, the interspecies interaction is described by the Bethe-Peierls binary contact condition on the wavefunction, which leads to a separable three-body Schrödinger equation in internal hyperspherical coordinates [11] even in a harmonic trap [17–19]. The hyperangular part of the problem can be solved in position space [11] or in momentum space [20]: the corresponding real eigenvalue s^2 (that will serve as a separability constant) obeys the transcendental equation $\Lambda_l(s) = 0$ of explicit expression [21]¹

$$\Lambda_l(s) = \cos \nu + \frac{1}{\sin \nu} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\nu}^{\frac{\pi}{2}+\nu} d\theta P_l \left(\frac{\cos \theta}{\sin \nu} \right) \frac{\sin(s\theta)}{\sin(s\pi)} \quad (3)$$

with $l \in \mathbb{N}$ the angular momentum, P_l a Legendre polynomial, $\nu = \arcsin \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ the mass angle. We call $(u_{l,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ the positive roots of Λ_l , sorted in increasing order. There is no complex root for $\alpha < \alpha_c$. The hyperradial part of the wavefunction, after multiplication by R^2 , solves an effectively bidimensional Schrödinger equation:

$$EF = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \left(F'' + \frac{1}{R} F' \right) + \left(\frac{\hbar^2 s^2}{2MR^2} + \frac{1}{2} M \omega^2 R^2 \right) F \quad (4)$$

where s is any of the $u_{l,n}$, $M = 2m_1 + m_2$ is the mass of two particles of species 1 and one particle of species 2, and the hyperradius R is the corresponding mass-weighted root-mean-square deviation of the positions of the three

particles from their center of mass. Solving Eq.(4) with the usual boundary conditions that $F(R)$ vanishes at zero and infinity gives

$$E = (s + 1 + 2q)\hbar\omega, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N} \quad (5)$$

The semi-infinite ladder structure of this spectrum, with equidistance $2\hbar\omega$, reflects the existence of an undamped breathing mode of the trapped non-efimovian unitary gas [23] related to its $SO(2, 1)$ dynamical symmetry [24].

Finally $B_{2,1}$ is the $\omega \rightarrow 0$ limit of a series [12]²:

$$B_{2,1} = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \sum_{(l,n,q) \in \mathbb{N}^3} (2l+1) \left[e^{-(u_{l,n}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega} - e^{-(v_{l,n}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega} \right] \quad (6)$$

with $v_{l,n} = l + 2n + 1$ the positive poles of $\Lambda_l(s)$ [21]. The summation over q can be done, and even over n by inverse application of the residue theorem [12]:

$$B_{2,1} = - \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \left(l + \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dS}{\pi} \ln \frac{\Lambda_l(iS)}{\cos \nu} \quad (7)$$

As shown in Fig. 1, the result agrees with the numerical evaluation of the series by [16]. The analytics however directly allows to see why $B_{2,1}$ has an infinite derivative with respect to α at $\alpha = \alpha_c^-$: it suffices to isolate the contribution of the channel $(l, n) = (1, 0)$ in Eq.(6), the only one where $u_{l,n}$ vanishes at $\alpha = \alpha_c$, by the splitting

$$B_{2,1} = B_{2,1}^{(1,0)} + B_{2,1}^{\neq(1,0)} \quad (8)$$

All the other channels have $u_{l,n} > 1$ over the figure range and give a smooth contribution to $B_{2,1}$. On the contrary

$$\begin{aligned} B_{2,1}^{(1,0)} &= \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} 3 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \left[e^{-(u_{1,0}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega} - e^{-(v_{1,0}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega} \right] \\ &= -\frac{3}{2}(u_{1,0} - v_{1,0}) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and $u_{1,0}$ vanishes as $(\alpha_c - \alpha)^{1/2}$ since $\Lambda_1(s)$ is even, so that $\frac{d}{d\alpha} B_{2,1}$ diverges as $(\alpha_c - \alpha)^{-1/2}$ at the threshold.

Case $\alpha > \alpha_c$: Efimov zero-range model. – We now assume that the mass ratio obeys $\alpha_c < \alpha < 75.99449\dots$ [25], so that the Efimov effect takes place in the sector $l = 1$ only. The function $\Lambda_{l=1}$ has a pair of complex conjugate purely imaginary roots $\pm s$ and we set

$$u_{l=1,n=0} = s = i|s| \quad (10)$$

Then the $1/R^2$ potential in Schrödinger's equation (4) for $F(R)$ becomes attractive, which leads to a “fall to the

²Actually one calculates the difference between partition functions of unitary and non-interacting problems; still this directly gives $B_{2,1}$ of the unitary gas since $B_{2,1}$ is zero for the ideal gases; the contributions of the laughlinian states (whose wavefunction vanishes when two particles are at the same point) cancel out in the difference; the $v_{l,n}$ appear via the non-laughlinian spectrum of the non-interacting three-body problem. Similarly, the contributions of the unphysical root $s = 2$ in the sector $l = 0$, which exists in both the unitary and non-interacting cases, automatically cancel out.

¹There exists a less explicit hypergeometric expression for Λ_l [22].




Fig. 1: Reduced third cluster coefficient $e^{\beta E_0} \bar{B}_{2,1}$ of a trapped two-component three-dimensional unitary Fermi gas in the zero trapping frequency limit, as a function of the mass ratio $\alpha = m_1/m_2$ of the two species, for various values of the three-body parameter R_t , and hence of the global energy scale E_{glob} of Eqs.(13,24). Here E_0 is the ground free-space three-body energy, a smooth function of α : for $\alpha \leq \alpha_c$, $E_0 = 0$; for $\alpha > \alpha_c$, $E_0 = -E_{\text{glob}} \exp(-2\pi/|s|)$ is the ground trimer energy and the factor $\exp(\beta E_0)$ ensures that the plotted quantity remains bounded. From bottom to top for $\alpha \lesssim 15$: $\beta E_{\text{glob}} = 10^2$ (cyan), 3×10^2 (red), 10^3 (green), 3×10^3 (blue), 10^4 (violet), 10^5 (orange), 10^6 (magenta). For $\alpha > 15$, the curves cross, indicating that $e^{\beta E_0} \bar{B}_{2,1}$ is not always, at fixed α , an increasing function of βE_{glob} . Discontinuous black solid line: limit $\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty$, corresponding for $\alpha \leq \alpha_c$ to the genuine 0-parameter zero-range model studied numerically in [16] (black circles), and being, for $\alpha > \alpha_c$, identically equal to 3, the ground-trimer contribution. Vertical dotted line: critical mass ratio α_c where the Efimov effect sets in.

center” [26] and to an unphysical continuous spectrum of bound states, forcing one to modify the boundary condition at $R = 0$ [27]:

$$F(R) \underset{R \rightarrow 0}{=} (R/R_t)^{|s|} - (R/R_t)^{-|s|} + O(R^2) \quad (11)$$

To make evident that the third cluster coefficient now depends on *one* parameter, this length R_t called three-body parameter, we write it as $\bar{B}_{2,1}$, that is with *one* overlining bar. In free space, Eq.(11) leads to a discrete infinite number of Efimov trimer states, with a purely geometric spectrum extending from $-\infty$ to 0. In any physical system, however, the interaction is not strictly zero range and the spectrum must be bounded from below [11]. One may expect that finite range effects then spoil the geometric nature of the spectrum for the more deeply bound trimers. However, for a narrow Feshbach resonance [21, 28], for momentum-space cut-off models of a Feshbach resonance [29, 30], and for the three-body hard core model [13], the spectrum is almost entirely geometric, at least when $|s|$ is not too large ($|s| \lesssim 1$), and becomes entirely geometric when $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_c^+$, since the typical particle wavenumber times the interaction range tends to zero [21]. In what follows, we assume the free space geometric spec-

trum bounded from below:

$$\epsilon_q(0^+) = -E_{\text{glob}} e^{-2\pi(1+q)/|s|}, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N} \quad (12)$$

The global energy scale E_{glob} can be calculated from a microscopic model for the interaction, as it was done in the above mentioned models. Here we take it as a parameter that solution of Eq.(4) with $\omega = 0$ and with the boundary condition (11) relates to R_t as

$$E_{\text{glob}} = \frac{2\hbar^2}{MR_t^2} e^{[\ln \Gamma(1+s) - \ln \Gamma(1-s)]/s} \quad (13)$$

with $\ln \Gamma$ the usual branch of the Γ function logarithm.

The contribution to $\bar{B}_{2,1}$ of the channels $(l, n) \neq (1, 0)$ is unchanged since no Efimov effect occurs in these channels:

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{\neq(1,0)} = B_{2,1}^{\neq(1,0)} \quad (14)$$

We calculate it as in [12], using Eq.(7) as it is for $l \neq 1$, while substituting $\Lambda_l(iS)$ with $\frac{S^2 + v_{l,0}^2}{S^2 + u_{l,0}^2} \Lambda_l(iS)$ for $l = 1$. In the efimovian channel $(l, n) = (1, 0)$, the spectrum is no longer given by Eq.(5), but by the solution of the transcendental equation deduced from [31] and rewritten as in [12, 32] to match Eq.(12) in free space:

$$\text{Im} \ln \Gamma\left(\frac{1+s-\epsilon_q/(\hbar\omega)}{2}\right) + \frac{|s|}{2} \ln\left(\frac{2\hbar\omega}{E_{\text{glob}}}\right) + (q+1)\pi = 0 \quad (15)$$

so that the first identity in Eq.(9) is replaced by

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)} = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} 3 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \left[e^{-\beta \epsilon_q(\omega)} - e^{-(v_{1,0} + 1 + 2q)\beta \hbar\omega} \right] \quad (16)$$

For a small enough but non-zero ω , two classes emerge in the three-body spectrum: (i) negative energy eigenstates, that are the equivalent of free space trimer states, and (ii) positive energy eigenstates, that are the equivalent of the free space continuum. The second class has a harmonic spectrum except for an energy dependent “quantum defect” $\Delta(\epsilon)$ [32]

$$\frac{\epsilon_q(\omega)}{\hbar\omega} \underset{q \rightarrow +\infty}{=} 2q + \Delta(\epsilon_q(\omega)) + O(1/q) \quad (17)$$

where $q\omega$ is \approx fixed. By the reasoning of [12], we get

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)} = 3 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}} (e^{-\beta \epsilon_q(0^+)} - 1) - \frac{3}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} d\epsilon \beta [\Delta(\epsilon) - (1 + v_{1,0})] e^{-\beta \epsilon} \quad (18)$$

We obtained a new expression of the quantum defect³:

$$\Delta(\epsilon) = 2 + \frac{2}{\pi} \text{atan} \frac{\tan(\frac{|s|x}{2})}{\text{th}(\frac{|s|x}{2}\pi)} + 2 \left\lfloor \frac{|s|x}{2\pi} \right\rfloor \quad (19)$$

³This expression and the one (C6) of [32] are equal, since their difference is a continuous function of x that vanishes at zero and has an identically zero derivative.

where $x = \ln(\epsilon/E_{\text{glob}})$. The nearest-integer function in the last term exactly compensates the jumps of the atan function when $\tan(|s|x/2)$ diverges, so as to render $\Delta(\epsilon)$ a smooth function of ϵ and of $|s|$.

The corresponding values of $\bar{B}_{2,1}$ for $\alpha > \alpha_c$ are shown in Fig.1, after multiplication by a factor $e^{\beta E_0}$, where $E_0 = \epsilon_{q=0}(0^+)$ is the ground trimer energy, so as to absorb its contribution that becomes rapidly dominant and divergent for $k_B T < |E_0|$ [33]. The result depends on βE_{glob} , a parameter that must be $\gg 1$: our theory, being zero range, requires that R_t , of order the interaction range or effective range, as in the three-body hard core and narrow Feshbach resonance models respectively, is \ll the thermal de Broglie wavelength $\lambda_t = [2\pi\hbar^2/(Mk_B T)]^{1/2}$. Clearly, there is a discrepancy of $B_{2,1}(\alpha)$ and $\bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha)$ at α_c^\mp at non-zero R_t . When $R_t \rightarrow 0$ ($E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty$) there is agreement at α_c , as seen by first taking the $s \rightarrow 0$ limit in Eq.(19),

$$\Delta(\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_c^\pm} \Delta_0(\epsilon) = 2 + \frac{2}{\pi} \operatorname{atan} \frac{\ln(\epsilon/E_{\text{glob}})}{\pi} \quad (20)$$

then taking the $R_t \rightarrow 0$ limit in Eq.(18)⁴:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha_c^+) &= -\frac{3}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} d\epsilon \beta [\Delta_0(\epsilon) - (1 + v_{1,0})] e^{-\beta\epsilon} \\ &= \frac{3}{2} v_{1,0} - \frac{3}{\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}} + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}}\right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

successfully collated with the $u_{1,0} \rightarrow 0$ value of Eq.(9). The key point however is that this $R_t \rightarrow 0$ limit is in practice inaccessible, due to the very slow logarithmic convergence. We expect this problem to extend to $\alpha < \alpha_c$, which makes the strictly zero-range calculation of [16] not fully realistic. There also remains the puzzle of the diverging derivative of $B_{2,1}(\alpha)$ with respect to α at α_c^- . Both issues are solved in the next section.

Case $\alpha < \alpha_c$ revised: 1-parameter zero-range model. – We now see that a three-body parameter R_t must be introduced for $\alpha < \alpha_c$, i. e. even in the absence of Efimov effect, when α is close enough to α_c . The root $s = u_{1,0} > 0$ then approaches 0 and the centrifugal barrier in the hyperradial equation (4) weakens, so that the function $F(R)$, the eigenenergies E and the third cluster coefficient become increasingly sensitive to short distance physics of the interaction [30, 34].

Assume that the three-body physics inside the interaction range is described by an extra term $V(R)F$ in Eq.(4), e.g. some three-body hard core of range b . Knowing that the relevant eigenenergies E are at most a few $k_B T$, and that $b \ll \lambda_t$, we can make the following reasonings.

(i) at $R \ll \lambda_t$, one can obtain the behavior of $F(R)$ by a zero-energy calculation (neglecting the EF term) in free space (since the harmonic oscillator length is $\gg \lambda_t$). Due to $b \ll \lambda_t$ there exists a range $b \ll R \ll \lambda_t$ where

⁴One takes $\beta\epsilon$ as integration variable and one expands the integrand in powers of $1/\ln(\beta E_{\text{glob}})$.

one can also neglect $V(R)$. Then $F(R)$ is a superposition of the two particular solutions R^s and R^{-s} , with relative amplitudes fixed by the microscopic details of $V(R)$ ⁵:

$$F(R) \underset{b \ll R \ll \lambda_t}{\simeq} (R/R_t)^s - (R/R_t)^{-s} \quad (22)$$

e.g. $R_t = b$ for a three-body hard core of radius b .

(ii) one can approach the same range $b \ll R \ll \lambda_t$ from large distances. The trapping potential and the EF term must now be kept, and $F(R)$ is the unique solution (up to a normalisation factor) of Eq.(4) that does not diverge at infinity, a Whittaker function divided by R [19]. Then at $R \ll \lambda_t$, $F(R)$ is also found to be a linear superposition of R^s and R^{-s} , as it must be, but with coefficients $A_\pm(E)$ that are known functions of E . Matching with Eq.(22) gives an implicit equation for E , as if Eq.(4) was subjected to the modified boundary condition at $R = 0$ [18, 35]⁶:

$$F(R) \underset{R \rightarrow 0}{=} (R/R_t)^s - (R/R_t)^{-s} + O(R^{2-s}) \quad (23)$$

The third term in Eq.(23), coming from a property of the Whittaker function, is indeed negligible as compared to the first one, and this model makes sense, only when $s < 1$. Remarkably this reproduces the Efimov zero-range model (11) if one formally replaces s by $i|s|$. Then it is natural to extend the definition of E_{glob} to $\alpha < \alpha_c$ ⁷:

$$E_{\text{glob}} \underset{0 < s < 1}{=} \left(\frac{\Gamma(1+s)}{\Gamma(1-s)} \right)^{1/s} \frac{2\hbar^2}{MR_t^2} \quad (24)$$

where the first factor is a smooth function of α , as its series expansion involves only even powers of s .

The more common boundary condition $F(R=0) = 0$, that led to the spectrum (5), is usually justified as follows: at $R \approx \lambda_t$, the R^{-s} term in (22) is negligible as compared to the R^s term in the zero-range limit $b \ll \lambda_t$, that is $\beta E_{\text{glob}} \gg 1$, as one expects $R_t \approx b$ ⁸:

$$\frac{(\lambda_t/R_t)^{-s}}{(\lambda_t/R_t)^s} \approx (\beta E_{\text{glob}})^{-s} \ll 1 \quad (25)$$

However this condition becomes more and more difficult to satisfy when $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_c^-$, and it will be violated when

$$s \lesssim \frac{1}{\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}} \quad (26)$$

⁵If one sets $F(R) = R^{-s}\phi(r = R^{2s})$ then $F'' + F'/R - s^2 F/R^2 = 4s^2 R^{3s-2} \phi''(r)$ so that $R_t^{2s} = a_{\text{eff}}$, where a_{eff} is the s -wave scattering “length” of a particle of mass M on the potential $v(r) = V(r^{1/(2s)})r^{-2+1/s}/(4s^2)$. We suppose here that $a_{\text{eff}} > 0$, e.g. because $V(R)$ is non-negative.

⁶For $s = 0$ this becomes $F(R) = \ln(R/R_t) + O(R^2 \ln R)$.

⁷On a narrow resonance of Feshbach length R_* one gets from [21] $(\frac{m_r R_*^2}{2\hbar^2} E_{\text{glob}})^s = \frac{1-s}{1+s} \frac{\Gamma(1+2s)}{\Gamma(1-2s)} f(v_{1,0}) \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{f(v_{1,n})}{f(u_{1,n})}$ with $f(z) = \Gamma(z-s)\Gamma(1+z-s)/[\Gamma(z+s)\Gamma(1+z+s)]$.

⁸In peculiar cases, known as three-body resonances, see [18, 35], R_t/b can be arbitrarily large and βE_{glob} can remain finite in the zero-range limit. This is improbable here as there is already a two-body resonance.

This forces us to recalculate the third cluster coefficient with the boundary condition (23). From the implicit equation for the energy spectrum $(\epsilon_q(\omega))_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ [19]⁹:

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+s-E/\hbar\omega}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1-s-E/\hbar\omega}{2}\right)} = \left(\frac{E_{\text{glob}}}{2\hbar\omega}\right)^s \quad (27)$$

we recalculate the quantum defect as in [32], using the Euler reflection and Stirling formulas:

$$\Delta(\epsilon) = 2 + \frac{2}{\pi} \operatorname{atan} \frac{\operatorname{th}\left[\frac{s}{2} \ln(\epsilon/E_{\text{glob}})\right]}{\tan\left(\frac{s}{2}\pi\right)} \quad (28)$$

When $R_t \rightarrow 0$, $\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty$ and this reproduces the value $1+s$ of the quantum defect in Eq.(5). Eq.(28) only revises the contribution of the channel (1,0), since the other channels have $u_{1,n} > 1$ for the values of α in Fig. 1:

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)} \stackrel{0 < s < 1}{=} -\frac{3}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} d\epsilon \beta [\Delta(\epsilon) - (1 + v_{1,0})] e^{-\beta\epsilon} \quad (29)$$

In Fig. 1 we plot for $\alpha < \alpha_c$ the corresponding values of $\bar{B}_{2,1}$, for the same values of the parameter βE_{glob} as in the part $\alpha > \alpha_c$ of the figure, leading to an apparently smooth connection at $\alpha = \alpha_c$. The continuity of the connection could be expected from the fact that (i) the formal change $s \rightarrow i|s|$ in Eq.(28) reproduces the value (19) of the quantum defect on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$ apart from the nearest-integer function which is irrelevant when $|s| \rightarrow 0$, and (ii) the efimovian trimer spectrum has a vanishing contribution to $\bar{B}_{2,1}$ when $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_c^+$.

Indeed $\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha)$ (and $\bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha)$) are smooth functions of α at α_c at fixed βE_{glob} , since $\Delta(\epsilon)$ is an even function of s and its series expansion only has even powers of s :

$$\Delta(\epsilon) \stackrel{s \rightarrow 0}{=} \Delta_0(\epsilon) - \frac{x}{6} s^2 + \frac{x^3 - \pi^2 x}{360} s^4 + O(s^6) \quad (30)$$

where $\Delta_0(\epsilon)$ given by Eq.(20), $x = \ln(\epsilon/E_{\text{glob}})$ and s can be real or purely imaginary. Insertion in Eq.(29) leads to converging integrals over ϵ and to an expansion of $\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}$ with only even powers of s :

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha) - \bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha_c) \stackrel{s \rightarrow 0}{=} -\frac{A}{4} s^2 - \frac{A(\pi^2 - \gamma^2 - A^2) - 4\zeta(3)}{480} s^4 + O(s^6) \quad (31)$$

where $A = \ln(e^\gamma \beta E_{\text{glob}})$ and $\gamma \simeq 0.577$ is Euler's constant¹⁰. Since s^2 is a smooth function of α across α_c , so is $\bar{B}_{2,1}$.

⁹The ground state solution of this equation must be omitted, because it connects when $\omega \rightarrow 0$ to a bound state of energy $-E_{\text{glob}}$ and spatial extension $\approx R_t$, which cannot be faithfully described by our zero-range model when $R_t \approx b$ (i.e. in the absence of three-body resonance) and indeed does not exist in the three-body hard-core or in the narrow Feshbach resonance model.

¹⁰Exchange of Taylor expansion and integration is justified by the theorem of derivation under the integral, where x is the integration variable. For $\alpha < \alpha_c$, one sets $u(x, s) = \operatorname{th}(sx/2)/s$ and $v(x, s) =$




Fig. 2: Scaling-law analysis of Fig.1 for α close to α_c in the limit $\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty$. (a) For a fixed $t \equiv s \ln(\beta E_{\text{glob}})$: the data approach the law (33) (black solid line), provided that $|t| < 2\pi$ on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$. From top to bottom: $\beta E_{\text{glob}} = 10^2$ (cyan), 10^4 (violet). Dashed line: 0-parameter theory prediction $-3t/2$. (b) On the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$, for a fixed $u \equiv [|t|/(2\pi) - 1] \ln(\beta E_{\text{glob}})$: the data approach the law (34) (black solid line), which explains the peaked structure observed in Fig.1. From bottom to top for $u < -0.6$: values of βE_{glob} listed in caption of Fig.1, with same order and colors.

Eq.(31), combined with $\Lambda_1(s) = 0$, predicts how the first order derivative at α_c diverges when $\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} \bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha_c) \stackrel{\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} C \ln \beta E_{\text{glob}} \quad \text{with } C \simeq 0.0478243 \quad (32)$$

It also suggests an interesting scaling law close to α_c : keeping in the coefficients of the powers of s in (31) only the leading terms in $\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}$, one uncovers, after multiplication of (31) by $\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}$, the following law when βE_{glob} diverges to infinity at fixed $t \equiv s \ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}$:

$$(\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}) [\bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha) - \bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha_c)] \stackrel{t \text{ fixed}}{\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty} \rightarrow 3 - \frac{3t/2}{\operatorname{th}(t/2)} \quad (33)$$

with no constraint on the $\alpha < \alpha_c$ side, and with the constraint that $|t| < 2\pi$ on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$ due to the occurrence of a pole at $t = 2\pi i$ in the quantum defect contribution and to a divergence of the ground trimer contribution for $|t| > 2\pi$. Eq.(33) is obtained by neglecting $\ln(\beta\epsilon)$ as compared to $\ln(\beta E_{\text{glob}})$ in (19,28), as $\beta\epsilon$ is typically unity in the integral (29). In Fig. 2a we replot the data of Fig.1 after rescaling as in Eq.(33): the results are indeed almost aligned on a single scaling curve given by Eq.(33), the better the larger $\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}$ is. The 0-parameter zero-range theory prediction $-3t/2$, see dashed line, is only asymptotically equivalent to the correct law at $t \rightarrow +\infty$. The

$\tan(\pi s/2)/s$ and one fixes some $\eta \in]0, 1[$. Then there exist positive numbers $(A_n, B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $C > 0$ such that $\forall (x, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \eta]$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$: $|\partial_s^n u(x, s)| \leq A_n |x|^{n+1}$, $|\partial_s^n v(x, s)| \leq B_n$, $u(x, s)^2 + v(x, s)^2 \geq C$. For $\alpha > \alpha_c$ one sets $u(x, |s|) = [\pi \sin(|s|x) - x \sinh(\pi|s|)]/|s|^2$ and $v(x, |s|) = [\cosh(\pi|s|) - \cos(|s|x)]/|s|^2$ and one fixes some $\eta > 0$. Then there exist positive numbers $(A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $G > 0$ such that $\forall (x, |s|) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \eta]$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$: $|\partial_{|s|}^n u(x, |s|)| \leq A_n |x| + B_n |x|^{n+2}$, $|\partial_{|s|}^n v(x, |s|)| \leq C_n + D_n |x|^{2+n}$, $|v(x, |s|)| \geq G$. The u and v functions appear in $\partial_s \Delta(\epsilon)$ as $(v \partial_s u - u \partial_s v)/(u^2 + v^2)$ for $\alpha < \alpha_c$, and in $\partial_{|s|} \Delta(\epsilon)$ as u/v for $\alpha > \alpha_c$. Then $|\partial_s^n \Delta|$ and $|\partial_{|s|}^n \Delta|$ are polynomially bounded in $|x|$ uniformly in s or $|s| \forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

scaling law fully justifies the intuitive condition (26): the crossover from the 0- to the 1-parameter zero-range regime indeed occurs for $s \approx 1/\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}}$.

What happens on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$ close to $|t| = 2\pi$? For $|t|$ fixed to a value $> 2\pi$, the ground-trimer contribution $3[e^{-\beta E_0} - 1]$, where $E_0 = \epsilon_0(0^+)$, rapidly diverges when $\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty$ and dominates all other contributions, so that the reduced cluster coefficient $e^{\beta E_0} \bar{B}_{2,1}$ of Fig. 1 tends to three. However, before that, the reduced cluster coefficient exhibits as a function of α an interesting structure in Fig. 1, a sharp rise with a maximum, that corresponds to a neighbourhood of $|t| = 2\pi$ with a width $1/\ln(\beta E_{\text{glob}})$. This is revealed by the affine change of variable $u \equiv [|t|/(2\pi) - 1](\ln \beta E_{\text{glob}})$. When $\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty$ for a fixed u , $\beta E_0 \rightarrow -e^u$, the ground-trimer contribution remains finite and, from dominated convergence theorem,

$$e^{\beta E_0} \bar{B}_{2,1} \xrightarrow[\beta E_{\text{glob}} \rightarrow +\infty]{u \text{ fixed}} e^{-e^u} \left[B_{2,1}(\alpha_c) + 3 \left(e^{e^u} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{3}{\pi} \int_0^{+\infty} d\epsilon \beta e^{-\beta \epsilon} \operatorname{atan} \frac{u - \ln \beta \epsilon}{\pi} \right] \quad (34)$$

where $B_{2,1}(\alpha_c) \simeq 1.7153$ [16] is the prediction of the 0-parameter zero-range theory at α_c . As shown in Fig. 2b, the rescaled data of Fig. 1 nicely converge to this law.

Conclusion. – As compared to the usual zero-range theory we have found corrections of order $1/\ln(\lambda_t/R_t)$ to the third virial coefficient of the two-component unitary Fermi gas, close to and below the threshold for the Efimov effect, at a distance $\alpha_c - \alpha$ scaling as $1/[\ln(\lambda_t/R_t)]^2$, where R_t is a three-body parameter and λ_t a thermal de Broglie wavelength. As a consequence, for a given finite λ_t/R_t as in all realistic systems, the third virial coefficient reconnects smoothly to its values deduced from the Efimov zero-range model above the threshold, precluding the unphysical first-order phase transition predicted by the zero-range theory. These $1/\ln(\lambda_t/R_t)$ corrections are dominant over the more usual (but here neglected) corrections, originating from finite interaction range effects at the two-body level, since these should vanish as power laws with R_t [36]¹¹.

Acknowledgments. – S.E. thanks JSPS for support.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics* (Wiley, New York, 1963).
- [2] E. Beth, G.E. Uhlenbeck, *Physica III* **8**, 729 (1936); *Physica IV* **10**, 915 (1937).
- [3] P.C. Hemmer, *Phys. Lett.* **27A**, 377 (1968); B. Jancovi, *Phys. Rev.* **178**, 295 (1969); *Phys. Rev.* **184**, 119 (1969); B. Jancovici, S. Merkuriev, *Phys. Rev. A* **12**, 2610 (1975).
- [4] T.D. Lee, C.N. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **116**, 25 (1959); A. Pais, G.E. Uhlenbeck, *Phys. Rev.* **116**, 250 (1959); S.K. Adhikari, R.D. Amado, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **27**, 485 (1971); W.G. Gibson, *Phys. Rev. A* **6**, 2469 (1972).
- [5] K.M. O'Hara *et al.*, *Science* **298**, 2179 (2002); T. Bourdel *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 020402 (2003); C.A. Regal, M. Greiner, D.S. Jin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 040403 (2004); M. Zwierlein *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 120403 (2004).
- [6] A. Comtet, Y. Georgelin, S. Ouvry, *J. Phys. A* **22**, 3917 (1989); J. McCabe, S. Ouvry, *Phys. Lett. B* **260**, 113 (1990).
- [7] Xia-Ji Liu, Hui Hu, P. D. Drummond, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 160401 (2009); *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 023619 (2010).
- [8] D.K. Kaplan, Sichun Sun, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 030601 (2011); X. Leyronas, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 053633 (2011).
- [9] M. Horikoshi, S. Nakajima, M. Ueda, T. Mukaiyama, *Science* **327**, 442 (2010); N. Navon, S. Nascimbène, F. Chevy, C. Salomon, *Science* **328**, 729 (2010); Mark Ku, A. Sommer, L. Cheuk, M. Zwierlein, *Science* **335**, 563 (2012).
- [10] S. Nascimbène *et al.*, *Nature* **463**, 1057 (2010).
- [11] V. Efimov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **12**, 589 (1971); V. Efimov, *Nucl. Phys. A* **210**, 157 (1973); A. Bulgac, V. Efimov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **22**, 296 (1975).
- [12] Y. Castin, F. Werner, *Rev. can. phys.* **91**, 382 (2013).
- [13] J. von Stecher, *J. Phys. B* **43**, 101002 (2010).
- [14] S. Piątek, W. Krauth, *Nature Comm.* **5**, 3503 (2014).
- [15] D.S. Petrov, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 010703 (2003); E. Braaten, H.-W. Hammer, *Phys. Rep.* **428**, 259 (2006).
- [16] K.M. Daily, D. Blume, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 013609 (2012).
- [17] F. Werner, Y. Castin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 150401 (2006).
- [18] F. Werner, Y. Castin, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 053604 (2006); Y. Castin, F. Werner, chap. 5, *The BCS-BEC Crossover and the Unitary Fermi gas*, LNIP 836, W. Zwerger ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2011).
- [19] F. Werner, PhD thesis, Univ. Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris, 2008), tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00285587.
- [20] R. Minlos, L. Faddeev, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **14**, 1315 (1962).
- [21] Y. Castin, E. Tignone, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 062704 (2011).
- [22] G. Gasaneo, J.H. Macek, *J. Phys. B* **35**, 2239 (2002); M. Birse, *J. Phys. A* **39**, L49 (2006).
- [23] Y. Castin, *Comptes Rendus Physique* **5**, 407 (2004).
- [24] L.P. Pitaevskii, A. Rosch, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, R853 (1997).
- [25] O. Kartavtsev, A. Malykh, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Phys.* **86**, 713 (2007).
- [26] L. Landau, E. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics* (Elsevier Science, Oxford, 2003).
- [27] P. Morse, H. Feshbach, *Methods of Theoretical Physics*, vol. II, p. 1665 (Mc Graw-Hill, New York, 1953).
- [28] L. Pricoupenko, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 043633 (2010).
- [29] M. Jona-Lasinio, L. Pricoupenko, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 023201 (2010).
- [30] S. Endo, P. Naidon, M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 062703 (2012).
- [31] S. Jonsell, H. Heiselberg, C.J. Pethick, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 250401 (2002).
- [32] F. Werner, Y. Castin, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 053633 (2012).
- [33] A. Pais, G.E. Uhlenbeck, *Phys. Rev.* **116**, 250 (1959).
- [34] A. Safavi-Naini, Seth T. Rittenhouse, D. Blume, H.R. Sadeghpour, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 032713 (2013).
- [35] Y. Nishida, Dam Thanh Son, Shina Tan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 090405 (2008).
- [36] F. Werner, Y. Castin, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 013626 (2012).

¹¹As in [36] the leading energy correction must vanish linearly in the binary interaction range for $s > 1/2$, more slowly otherwise. With this, the model (23) is consistent only for $s < 1/2$: from Eq.(29) at fixed s , $\bar{B}_{2,1} - B_{2,1} \sim -\frac{3}{\pi} \Gamma(s+1) \sin(s\pi)/(\beta E_{\text{glob}})^s$ if $R_t \rightarrow 0$.