

Effective noise theory for the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation with disorder

Erez Michaely and Shmuel Fishman

February 5, 2022

Physics Department, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel

Abstract

For the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation with disorder it was found numerically that in some regime of the parameters Anderson localization is destroyed and subdiffusion takes place for a long time interval. It was argued that the nonlinear term acts as random noise. In the present work the properties of this effective noise are studied numerically. Some assumptions made in earlier work were verified, and fine details were obtained. The dependence of various quantities on the localization length of the linear problem were computed. A scenario for the possible breakdown of the theory for a very long time is outlined.

1 Introduction

The Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation (NLSE) [1] in a random potential takes the form of

$$i\partial_t\psi = H_0\psi + \beta|\psi|^2\psi, \quad (1)$$

where H_0 is the linear part with a disordered potential, which on a lattice takes the form of

$$H_0\psi(x) = -(\psi(x+1) + \psi(x-1)) + \varepsilon(x)\psi(x). \quad (2)$$

In this work it is assumed that $\varepsilon(x)$ are identical independent random variables (i.i.d) uniformly distributed in the interval of $[-\frac{W}{2}, \frac{W}{2}]$.

The NLSE was derived for a variety of physical systems under some approximations. It was derived in classical optics where ψ is the electric field by expanding the index of refraction in powers of the electric field keeping only the leading nonlinear term [2]. For Bose-Einstein Condensates (BEC), the NLSE is a mean field approximation where the term proportional to the density $\beta|\psi|^2$ approximates the interaction between the atoms. In this field the NLSE is known as the Gross-Pitaevskii Equation (GPE) [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. It is well known that

in 1D in the presence of a random potential with probability one all the states are exponentially localized [8, 9, 10]. Consequently, diffusion is suppressed and in particular a wavepacket that is initially localized will not spread to infinity. This is the phenomenon of Anderson localization [11]. The problem defined by (1) is relevant for experiments in nonlinear optics, for example disordered photonic lattices [12, 13], where Anderson localization was found in presence of nonlinear effects as well as experiments on BECs in disordered optical lattices [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. The interplay between disorder and nonlinear effects leads to new interesting physics [20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27]. In spite of the extensive research, many fundamental problems are still open (see recent review to be published in Nonlinearity [28]). In particular there is disagreement between the analytical and the numerical results [29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37].

A natural question is whether a wave packet that is initially localized in space will indefinitely spread for dynamics controlled by (1). A simple argument indicates that spreading will be suppressed by randomness. If unlimited spreading takes place the amplitude of the wave function will decay since the l^2 norm is conserved. Consequently, the nonlinear term will become negligible and Anderson localization will take place as a result of the randomness as conjectured by Fröhlich *et al* [38]. Contrary to this intuition, based on the smallness of the nonlinear term resulting from the spread of the wave function, it is claimed that for the kicked-rotor a nonlinear term leads to delocalization if it is strong enough [39]. It is also argued that the same mechanism results in delocalization for the model (1) with sufficiently large β , while, for weak nonlinearity, localization takes place [39, 40]. Recently, it was rigorously shown that the initial wavepacket cannot spread so that its amplitude vanishes at infinite time, for large enough β [41]. It does not contradict spreading of a fraction of the wavefunction. Indeed, subdiffusion was found in numerical experiments [39, 40, 42, 43, 44]. It was also argued that nonlinearity may enhance discrete breathers [26, 27]. In conclusion, it is *not* clear what is the long time behavior of a wave packet that is initially localized, if both nonlinearity and disorder are present [28]. The major difficulty in numerical resolution of this question is integration of (1) to large time. Most researchers who run numerical simulations use a split-step method for integration, however it is impossible to achieve convergence for large times, and therefore some heuristic arguments assuming that the numerical errors do not affect the results qualitatively, are utilized [39, 43]. Moreover the problem is chaotic, therefore the trajectories that are found are not the actual trajectories and it is argued that it does not affect the statistical results.

Recent rigorous arguments [29, 30] in the limit of strong disorder combined with perturbation theory [31, 32, 45] indicate that it is unlikely that sub-diffusion persists forever and the asymptotic growth is at most logarithmic in time. Also other recent work based on a scaling theory [33] and phase space considerations [36, 46] lead to similar indications. It is clear that there is a substantial regime in time and parameters where sub-diffusion may hold and the purpose of the present work is to analyze the dynamics in this regime.

Our analysis based on [43, 44], is conveniently expressed expanding the wave-

function

$$\psi(x, t) = \sum_n c_n(t) u_n(x) e^{-iE_n t} \quad (3)$$

where u_n are the eigenfunctions of H_0 typically falling off exponentially:

$$u_n(x) \approx \frac{e^{-|x_n - x|/\xi}}{\sqrt{\xi}} \varphi(x) \quad (4)$$

where $\varphi(x)$ is a random function of order unity. The localization center is x_n . The $c_n(t)$ satisfy

$$i\partial_t c_n(t) = \beta \sum_{m_1, m_2, m_3} V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3} e^{i(E_n + E_{m_1} - E_{m_2} - E_{m_3})t} c_{m_1}^* c_{m_2} c_{m_3} \equiv F_n(t) \quad (5)$$

and

$$V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3} = \sum_x u_n(x) u_{m_1}(x) u_{m_2}(x) u_{m_3}(x). \quad (6)$$

In [43, 44] it is argued that $F_n(t)$ behaves as random noise with rapidly decaying correlation functions. The implications are analyzed in Sec. 2 and tested numerically in Sec. 3. A scenario for the breakdown of the effective noise theory is outlined in Sec. 4. The results are summarized and open question are presented in Sec. 5.

2 The effective noise theory

The theory of SKFF (Skokos, Krimer, Komineas and Flach [43, 44]) assumes for spreading to take place to the region where the n -th state is localized from the region where the states m_1, m_2, m_3 have a large amplitude:

$$|c_{m_1}|^2 \approx |c_{m_2}|^2 \approx |c_{m_3}|^2 \approx \rho \quad (7)$$

while

$$|c_n|^2 \ll \rho \quad (8)$$

It is assumed that the RHS of (5) is a random function denoted by $F_n(t)$. We turn to estimate its typical behavior. First we note that the overlap sums (6) are random functions. Within the scaling theory for localization one expects that for sufficiently weak disorder their various moments are determined by the localization length. For the case where all indices (n, m_1, m_2, m_3) are identical the average is just the inverse participation ratio what is proportional to $1/\xi$. For the general case the scaling theory suggests it is a function only of ξ . Experience with scaling theories leads us to assume it is a power of ξ . Therefore we try the form,

$$\langle V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3} \rangle = C_0^{(1)} \xi^{-\eta_1}, \quad (9)$$

and for the second moment we try to fit to,

$$\langle |V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}|^2 \rangle = C_0^{(2)} \xi^{-2\eta_2}. \quad (10)$$

Here $C_0^{(1)}$ and $C_0^{(2)}$ are constants and $\langle \dots \rangle$ is an average over realizations. We note that when the m_i and n are all different the average of the overlap integrals vanishes. We should note that the localization length ξ is actually energy dependent. For weak disorder in the center of the band, $\xi \sim W^{-2}$ [47, 48], this relation holds for most energies in the energy band [47]. In what follows we will estimate the values of η_1 and η_2 for various disorder strengths and for various sites $(x_n, x_{m_1}, x_{m_2}, x_{m_3})$, which are within the localization length. Otherwise the sum (6) is negligible. It is not obvious that both (9) and (10) will scale in this way although it is expected from the scaling theory of localization, that this is the case for sufficiently weak disorder, namely large ξ . We demonstrate that this is indeed the case and there is a typical magnitude of the value of the of the overlap sum (6) and it scales as,

$$V = C_1 \xi^{-\eta} \quad (11)$$

where C_1 is a constant. Here and in what follows we denote by ξ the localization length in the center of the band.

Making the assumption that F_n is random combined with (7), the sum on the RHS of (5) consists of the order of ξ^3 terms, at least for weak disorder. These are rapidly oscillating in time, and it is a nonlinear function of the $c_{m_i}(t)$. Therefore it is suggestive that it can be considered random. This assumption will be tested in detail in subsection 3.1. The RHS of (5) is assumed to take the form [44]

$$F_n = V \mathcal{P} \beta \rho^{3/2} f_n(t) = \frac{C_1}{\xi^\eta} \mathcal{P} \beta \rho^{3/2} f_n(t) \quad (12)$$

where C_1 is a constant and

$$\mathcal{P} = A_0 \beta^\gamma \xi^\alpha \rho \quad (13)$$

is proportional to the number of "resonant modes", namely ones that strongly affect the dynamics of the state n . Although it is reasonable to assume that the number of resonant modes is proportional to the density ρ a strong argument for it is missing, nevertheless it is consistent with all numerical results [44, 43]. We assume here the form (13) where A_0 is a constant independent of β and ξ . In the end of this section we argue that within these assumption $\gamma = 1$ in agreement with the assumption of [44, 43]. The value of α is estimated numerically (see subsection 3.3). Under these assumptions (5) reduces to:

$$i\partial_t c_n(t) = F_n(t) \quad (14)$$

Assuming $F_n(t)$ can be considered random with rapidly decaying correlations, in particular we assume that the distribution function of $f_n(t)$ is stationary and the integral of correlation function $C(t') = \langle f(0) f(t') \rangle$, where $\langle \dots \rangle$ is the average over the random potential, converges. Integration results in

$$c_n(t) = -i \frac{C_1}{\xi^\eta} \mathcal{P} \beta \rho^{3/2} \int_0^t dt' f_n(t') \quad (15)$$

Integrating over a time interval which is sufficiently large yields:

$$\langle |c_n(t)|^2 \rangle = \frac{A_1}{\xi^{2\eta}} \mathcal{P}^2 \beta^2 \rho^3 t = A_1 A_0^2 \beta^{2(\gamma+1)} \rho^5 \xi^{2\alpha-2\eta} t \quad (16)$$

where A_1 is a constant. The value of $\langle |c_n(t)|^2 \rangle$ increases with time and equilibrium is achieved when it takes the value ρ . Transitions between states of the type of n (states with small amplitude) are ignored in this model. The required time for equilibration is

$$T = \frac{1}{B \xi^{-2} \rho^4} \quad (17)$$

where we define

$$B = A_1 A_0^2 \beta^{2(1+\gamma)} \xi^{2\alpha-2\eta+2} \quad (18)$$

The equilibration time T varies slowly compared to t (see discussion after (24)). In other words there is a separation of time scales. On the time scale T the system seems to reach equilibrium by a diffusion process and the density becomes constant in a region that includes the site n . Hence on this time scale it seems to equilibrate. On a longer time scales, there is an even longer equilibration time scale, and the resulting diffusion is even weaker. The consistency of the argument results of the fact that $\frac{dT}{dt} \rightarrow 0$ for $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore it is assumed that the variations of ρ and T are slow on the scale of t . This assumption is checked in the end of this section. The resulting diffusion coefficient is

$$D = C \frac{\xi^2}{T} = CB\rho^4 \quad (19)$$

where C is a constant. The assumption is that the nonlinear term generates a random walk with the characteristic steps T and ξ in time and space. At time scales $t \gg T$, there is diffusion and

$$M_2 = Dt, \quad (20)$$

where $M_1 = \sum x |\psi(x, t)|^2$ and the variance $M_2 = \sum (x - M_1)^2 |\psi(x, t)|^2$ are the first and second moments. Since the second moment M_2 is inversely proportional to ρ^2 one finds

$$\frac{1}{\rho^2} = A_2 CB \rho^4 t \quad (21)$$

where A_2 is a constant. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{\rho^2} = (A_2 CB t)^{1/3}. \quad (22)$$

The second moment satisfies:

$$M_2 = \frac{1}{A_2^{2/3}} (CB t)^{1/3} \quad (23)$$

and

$$T = \frac{1}{B\xi^{-2}\rho^4} = \frac{C^{2/3}A_2^{2/3}\xi^2 t^{2/3}}{B^{1/3}} = \frac{C\xi^2}{M_2}t. \quad (24)$$

The density ρ and the equilibration time T change with time as $\rho \sim t^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and $T \sim t^{\frac{2}{3}}$. Therefore for $\frac{d\rho}{dt} \sim t^{-\frac{4}{3}}$ and $\frac{dT}{dt} \sim t^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. First note that in the long time limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ both derivatives vanish and $\frac{d\rho}{dt} \ll \frac{dT}{dt}$. Therefore for the derivation of the equilibration time ρ can be considered constant and on long scales of spreading T and D can be considered constant. Therefore the theory is consistent for large t . Since in the *NLSE* β appears only via the combination $\beta|\psi(x)|^2$, it can appear in (18) and (19) only in the power 4 (that is in the combination $\beta^4\rho^4$) therefore $\gamma = 1$.

In the next section this theory will be tested numerically.

3 Numerical tests for the effective noise theory

In this section the theory presented in section 2 is tested numerically. In subsection 3.1 the distribution of the $F_n(t)$ is computed, in subsection 3.2 the first moments of the overlap sums are calculated while in subsection 3.3 the dependence of the second moment M_2 of (23) on ξ is evaluated.

3.1 Statistical properties of $F_n(t)$

In this subsection the statistical distribution of $F_n(t)$ is explored. For this purpose the time dependent *NLSE* (1) was solved numerically for a finite lattice of N sites, for N_R realizations of the random potential $\varepsilon(x)$ and for $W = 4$. The wavefunction $\psi(x, t)$ at time t was calculated for a single site excitation namely the initial condition $\psi(x, 0) = \delta_{x,0}$ using the split step method. The details of the numerical calculation are presented in the appendix. The expansion (3) of ψ in terms of eigenfunctions of the linear problem (2) yields,

$$i\partial_t c_n(t) = \sum_x \beta |\psi(x, t)|^2 \psi(x, t) u_n(x) e^{itE_n} \equiv F_n(t). \quad (25)$$

This equation was used to calculate $F_n(t)$ numerically for a lattice of N sites. In order to check whether $F_n(t)$ can be considered as noise we calculated its power spectrum and auto-correlation function. First we present results obtained for times up to $t = 10^5$ for $\beta = 1$, $W = 4$ ($\xi \approx 6.4$), $N = 1024$ for a single site excitation at $t = 0$. The calculation was performed for $N_R = 50$ realizations. For nearly all these realizations it was found that the second moment grows as $M_2 \propto t^{1/3}$ in agreement with the results of [40, 43, 44]. We focus first on such realizations and present the results for a specific realization in Fig. 1

The power spectrum is

$$S_n(\omega) = \left| \hat{F}_n(\omega) \right|^2, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\hat{F}_n(\omega) = \lim_{\tilde{t} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{t}}} \int_0^{\tilde{t}} F_n(t) \cdot e^{-i\omega t} dt. \quad (27)$$

It is plotted for some realization in Fig. 1.a for $n=0$. It exhibits a peak around $|\omega_0| \approx 1.72$ and its width is $\Delta\omega \approx 0.1$. The finite width is characteristic of noise. Also the Fourier transform of

$$\tilde{F}_n(t) = F_n(t) \cdot e^{-i\omega_0 t} \quad (28)$$

will exhibit a wide power spectrum near $\omega = 0$, with the width of $\Delta\omega$ that is characteristic of noise. The auto-correlation function of $F_n(t)$ is

$$C_n(\tau) = \overline{F_n(t) \cdot F_n^*(t + \tau)} \quad (29)$$

where bar denotes time average $\overline{g(t)} \equiv \lim_{\tilde{t} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{t}} \int_0^{\tilde{t}} g(t) dt$.

For $\tilde{F}_n(t)$ we define the auto-correlation function $\tilde{C}_n(\tau)$ that is just (29) with $F_n(t)$ replaced by $\tilde{F}_n(t)$. In Fig. 1.b we plot $C_n^{(R)} = \text{Re}(C_n(\tau))$ for $n = 0$ while in Fig.1.c the zoomed version is plotted. Note an oscillation of frequency of the order $|\omega_0| \approx 1.72$ that is superimposed on the function. In the corresponding plots of $\tilde{C}_n^{(R)} = \text{Re}(\tilde{C}_n(\tau))$, presented in Fig.1.d and Fig.1.e, one does not find this oscillation. Behavior of the imaginary part of the auto-correlation function $\tilde{C}_n^{(I)} = \text{Im}(\tilde{C}_n(\tau))$ is similar (see Fig.1.f). All results presented in Fig.1 are for $n = 0$. Similar results were found also for $n = 3$ and $n = 15$. We see that the auto-correlation function decays by 2 orders of magnitude on the scale of $\Delta\tau \approx 140$ (of the order of $2\pi/\Delta\omega \sim 65$). Therefore the correlation of $\tilde{F}_n(t)$ behaves as the one of noise with short time correlations. For realizations where the growth of the second moment $M_2 \sim t^{1/3}$ was not found, the power spectrum was found to be substantially narrower by 2 orders of magnitude. The calculations were repeated for $\beta = 2$ where similar results were found, and for $\beta = 0.5$. For the latter case the number of realizations where it was found that the second moment grows like $t^{1/3}$ is substantially smaller than for $\beta = 1$ or $\beta = 2$. In all cases where the width of the power spectrum was small the typical growth of the second moment $M_2 \sim t^{1/3}$ was not found and vice versa. *This demonstrates the strong relation between the effective noise behavior and the diffusive growth of the second moment. It also demonstrates the different behavior of various realizations of the randomness.*

We turn now to test the distribution of $\tilde{F}_n(t)$. For this purpose we sample $\tilde{F}_n(t)$ for a sequence of points separated by $t_a > \Delta\tau$, that is for points where the values of $\tilde{F}_n(t)$ are uncorrelated, and compute the distribution of $\tilde{F}_n(k \cdot t_a)$ for $k = (1, 2, \dots, K)$. The results are presented in Fig. 2 for $t = 10^5$, $t_a = 200$, $K = 500$.




Figure 1: The correlation $C_n(t)$ and power spectrum $S_n(\omega)$ of $F_n(t)$ for $W = 4$, $\beta = 1$, $N = 1024$, $t = 10^5$, $n = 0$. (a) The Power Spectrum $S_0(\omega)$, (b) The auto-correlation function $C_0^{(R)}(\tau)$, (c) The zoomed $C_0^{(R)}(\tau)$, (d) The auto-correlation function $\tilde{C}_0^{(R)}(\tau)$, (e) the zoomed $\tilde{C}_0^{(R)}(\tau)$, (f) the zoomed $\tilde{C}_0^{(I)}(\tau)$ [see text].




Figure 2: The distribution of $Y = \tilde{F}_n^{(R)}(k \cdot t_a)$ where $k = (1, 2, \dots, K)$, $K = 500$, $t_a = 200$, $t = 10^5$ and the bin size 0.0596. (a) For the same realization used in Fig. 1. (b) The distribution of values found for all $N_R = 50$ realizations.

3.2 Estimate of scaling of the matrix elements $V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}$ with ξ

The overlap sum $V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}$ is a random function. In this subsection the scaling of its typical values with the maximal localization length [47]

$$\xi \approx \frac{96}{W^2} \quad (30)$$

is evaluated. This relation holds in the limit of weak disorder. In the numerical calculations presented in this paper we vary W as the control parameter and the localization length is calculated from (30). The estimate (30) is a reasonable approximation for $W < 5.5$ or $\xi > 3.15$ as was checked explicitly (and used) in this subsection. We note that the $V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}$ take values of substantial magnitude when all the centers of localization of the states $u_n, u_{m_1}, u_{m_2}, u_{m_3}$ are within a distance ξ . Only such overlap sums are considered. The average of the overlap sums over realizations vanishes unless (n, m_1, m_2, m_3) consists of two pairs of identical values, $n = m_1$ and $m_2 = m_3$ and all permutations. We calculated $\langle |V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}|^2 \rangle$ and $\langle V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3} \rangle$ (where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes average over $N_R = 5000$ realizations) while $x_n, x_{m_1}, x_{m_2}, x_{m_3}$ are fixed fractions of ξ , while ξ (and W) are varied. Assuming $\langle V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3} \rangle \sim \xi^{-\eta_1}$ and $\langle |V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}|^2 \rangle \sim \xi^{-2\eta_2}$ while the variance $\langle (V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3})^2 \rangle - \langle V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3} \rangle^2$ scales as $\xi^{-2\eta_3}$, we estimate these exponents from Figures like Fig. 3. We conclude that $\eta_1 \approx \eta_2 \approx \eta_3 \approx 1$. Therefore the typical magnitude of the random variable $V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}$ scales as (11) with $\eta = 1$. Although this result is expected from the scaling theory of localization, it is not obvious a priori. In particular it is not clear what is the effect of cancellations of various terms resulting of opposite signs.

For $\xi \ll 11$ we could not obtain smooth curves of $V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}$. The reason is




Figure 3: A log-log plot of (b) $y = \ln \left\langle V_0^{0, \frac{\xi}{3}, \frac{\xi}{3}} \right\rangle$, (r) $y = \ln \left\langle \left(V_0^{0, \frac{\xi}{3}, \frac{\xi}{3}} \right)^2 \right\rangle$ and (g) $y = \ln \left(\left\langle \left(V_0^{0, \frac{\xi}{3}, \frac{\xi}{3}} \right)^2 \right\rangle - \left\langle V_0^{0, \frac{\xi}{3}, \frac{\xi}{3}} \right\rangle^2 \right)$ as a function of $x = \ln(\xi)$, for the parameters $N = 512$, $N_R = 5000$. The localization length varies in the interval $11 < \xi < 103$. The least square fit leads to $\eta_1 = 1.039$, $\eta_2 = 0.958$ and $\eta_3 = 0.853$ respectively.

that the centers of localization x_{m_i} are equal to the integer part of ξ/a where a is fixed and ξ varies. For small ξ the jumps in $V_n^{m_1, m_2, m_3}$ are significant, since ξ does not cover many integers. The results obtained indicate that scaling of the overlap sums as ξ^{-1} holds also for values $\xi < 11$. In summary for a crude evaluation one can assume (11) holds with $\eta = 1$.

3.3 The scaling of the second moment M_2 with ξ (and β)

In this subsection we will estimate the exponent α defined in (13). For this purpose we write (23) in the form

$$M_2 = At^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (31)$$

with

$$A = A_4 \xi^\nu \quad (32)$$

where $\nu = \frac{2}{3}(\alpha - \eta + 1)$ (see (18)) while A_4 is a constant independent of ξ . We used the split step method to obtain $\psi(x, t)$ for different realizations ($N_R = 30$)




Figure 4: The dependence of A defined by (31) and (32) for $\beta = 1$ (blue circles) and for $\beta = 3$ (red squares) on ξ . We denote $y = \ln(A)$ and $x = \ln(\xi)$. From the least square fit we find $\nu = 1.684$ for $\beta = 1$ (blue) and $\nu = 1.395$ for $\beta = 3$ (red).

and computed ψ until $t = 10^6$. Only realizations which satisfied $M_2 \sim t^{\frac{1}{3}}$ at some stage of the calculation were taken into account. This was the case for nearly all the N_R realizations for $\xi > 7$ and $\beta < 4$. In the other regimes it was not satisfied for a significant number of realizations. Fixing β we estimate ν from plots like Fig. 4. For $1 < \beta < 3.5$ using the fact that $\eta \approx 1$ we find that for $1.235 < \nu < 1.71$ for various values of β . The exponent α of (13) takes the values $1.85 < \alpha < 2.56$. We note the strong uncertainty of ν and α . These results indicate that $A \sim \xi^\nu$. It is an estimate of the order of magnitude but not a verification of this power law.

4 Possibility for the breakdown of the effective noise theory

For the effective noise theory it is essential that $F_n(t)$ can be considered random. For this the number of terms in the sum (5) that resonate with n should be large, namely \mathcal{P} should not be too small. The density ρ and therefore \mathcal{P} decrease with time. If \mathcal{P} is very small there may be a situation that as a result of fluctuations, the sum (5) is dominated just by one term and therefore it is effectively quasi periodic. If spreading is a result of the randomness of F_n , it

will stop then. Let us first estimate the time scale required to spread so that $\mathcal{P} \approx 1$. For this purpose let us write (13) in the form

$$\mathcal{P} \approx \bar{A} \xi^\alpha \rho \quad (33)$$

where $\bar{A} = A_0 \beta$. Since ρ decreases with time t there is a time scale when \mathcal{P} will become very small. Assuming the constants are of the order of unity, using (18) and (21) the time t^* when $\mathcal{P} \approx 1$ satisfies

$$\xi^{2\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{[\xi^{2(\alpha-\eta+1)} t^*]^{\frac{1}{3}}} \approx 1 \quad (34)$$

or

$$\xi^{(\frac{4}{3}\alpha + \frac{2}{3}(\eta-1))} \approx t^{*\frac{1}{3}} \quad (35)$$

resulting in

$$t^* \approx \xi^{(4\alpha + 2(\eta-1))} \quad (36)$$

for $1.85 < \alpha < 2.56$ and $\eta = 1$

$$t^* \approx \xi^\delta \quad (37)$$

where $7.4 < \delta < 10.24$

The time required for, $\mathcal{P} \ll 1$, when the effective noise theory may fail is even larger.

5 Summary and conclusions

The effective noise theory was introduced in [39] and was further developed in [43, 40, 44]. It was found to be consistent with the numerical results in some regimes. In Section 2 our interpretation of this theory was presented. In section 3 the details of this theory were tested numerically. In particular the distribution of the effective driving F_n defined in (5) was studied. The correlation function was calculated as well and was found to be characterized by a wide power spectrum and rapid decay with time. These were found only for realizations where subdiffusion with the second moment growing as $t^{1/3}$ is found, indicating the relation between this spreading and the approximation of F_n as effective noise. These results are purely numerical and support the effective noise theory. An obvious challenge is to obtain these results analytically. We determined that the behavior $A \approx \xi^\nu$ (see (32)), with $1.235 < \nu < 1.71$ is a reasonable approximation. From this we conclude that the dependence of \mathcal{P} on ξ (13) is controlled by the exponent $1.85 < \alpha < 2.56$. Although ξ varied over one decade and the evaluation of the exponent is crude we believe it may give the correct order of magnitude.

We turn to speculate how the effective noise theory may break down for a long time scale. Assuming the effective noise theory holds for long time, \mathcal{P} of (13) becomes extremely small, consequently the number of terms in the sum (5) that contribute significantly may become of order unity and F_n may turn to be quasi periodic rather than random. Therefore there is a time scale t^* given

by the estimate (35) so that for $t > t^*$ the effective noise theory is invalid. For such long time a sequence of peaks may replace the continuous region of the power spectrum in Fig 1.a. If localization is destroyed by the effective noise F_n , it is reasonable to expect localization or spreading slower than subdiffusion (say logarithmic in time) on time scale t^* and larger. Existence of such a time scale is consistent with [29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 45]. The scaling arguments used here should improve when the localization length ξ becomes large but then t^* becomes extremely large and it is impossible to explore numerically the scenario for the breakdown of the effective noise theory outlined in Sec. 4. Such a scenario may enable to reconcile the numerical results where subdiffusion is found [28, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44] with the analytical results predicting asymptotic spreading that is at most logarithmic [28, 29, 30, 31]. These points should be subject of future research.

Acknowledgment We would like to thank Y. Krivolapov for detailed discussions, extremely valuable technical detailed help and for extremely critical reading of the manuscript. We would like to thank J. Bodyfelt, S. Flach, D. Krimer, A. Pikovsky and A. Soffer for useful discussions. We thank a referee of Physical Review for suggesting the argument in the end of Sec.2 leading to $\gamma = 1$. This work was partly supported by the Israel Science Foundation (ISF), by the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), by the Minerva Center of Nonlinear Physics of Complex Systems, by the New York Metropolitan Research Fund and by the Shlomo Kaplansky academic chair.

Appendix: some details of the numerical calculations

We used the split step method to obtain the time evolution starting from the initial wavefunction. The lattice size N used is 512 or 1024. The reason we used the relatively large lattice is because we wanted to avoid boundary effects, namely we required the wavefunction amplitude to be smaller than 10^{-12} on the boundary. The time step used in the split step method is $dt = 0.1$. We used this time step because it is small enough relative to the time scales in the system at hand and large enough in order to complete the numerical calculation in reasonable time. It is the smallest time step used in [43, 44]. The initial condition used is a single site excitation in the middle of the lattice denoted by $x_n = 0$ namely, $\psi(x, t = 0) = \delta_{x,0}$.

References

- [1] C. Sulem and P. L. Sulem. *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation self-focusing and wave collapse*. Springer, 1999.

- [2] G. P. Agrawal. *Nonlinear fiber optics*, volume 4th. Academic Press, Burlington, MA ; London, 2007.
- [3] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari. Theory of Bose-Einstein condensation in trapped gases. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 71(3):463–512, 1999.
- [4] L. P. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari. *Bose-Einstein condensation*. Clarendon Press, Oxford ; New York, 2003.
- [5] A. J. Leggett. Bose-Einstein condensation in the alkali gases: Some fundamental concepts. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 73(2):307–356, 2001.
- [6] L.P. Pitaevskii. Vortex lines in an imperfect Bose gas. *JETP*, 13(2):451–454, 1961.
- [7] E.P. Gross. Structure of a quantized vortex in boson systems. *Nuovo Cimento*, 20(3):454–477, 1961.
- [8] K. Ishii. Localization of eigenstates and transport phenomena in one-dimensional disordered system. *Suppl. Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 53(53):77–138, 1973.
- [9] P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan. Disordered electronic systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 57(2):287–337, 1985.
- [10] I. M. Lifshits, L. A. Pastur, and S. A. Gredeskul. *Introduction to the theory of disordered systems*. Wiley, New York, 1988.
- [11] P. W. Anderson. Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices. *Phys. Rev.*, 109(5):1492, 1958.
- [12] T. Schwartz, G. Bartal, S. Fishman, and M. Segev. Transport and Anderson localization in disordered two-dimensional photonic lattices. *Nature*, 446(7131):52–55, 2007.
- [13] Y. Lahini, A. Avidan, F. Pozzi, M. Sorel, R. Morandotti, D. Christodoulides, and Y. Silberberg. Anderson localization and nonlinearity in one-dimensional disordered photonic lattices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100(1):013906, Jan 2008.
- [14] H. Gimperlein, S. Wessel, J. Schmiedmayer, and L. Santos. Ultracold atoms in optical lattices with random on-site interactions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95(17):170401, 2005.
- [15] J. E. Lye, L. Fallani, M. Modugno, D. S. Wiersma, C. Fort, and M. Inguscio. Bose-Einstein condensate in a random potential. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95(7):070401, 2005.

- [16] D. Clement, A. F. Varon, M. Hugbart, J. A. Retter, P. Bouyer, L. Sanchez-Palencia, D. M. Gangardt, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and A. Aspect. Suppression of transport of an interacting elongated Bose-Einstein condensate in a random potential. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95(17):170409, 2005.
- [17] D. Clement, A. F. Varon, J. A. Retter, L. Sanchez-Palencia, A. Aspect, and P. Bouyer. Experimental study of the transport of coherent interacting matter-waves in a 1D random potential induced by laser speckle. *New J. Phys.*, 8:165, 2006.
- [18] L. Sanchez-Palencia, D. Clement, P. Lugan, P. Bouyer, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and A. Aspect. Anderson localization of expanding Bose-Einstein condensates in random potentials. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98(21):210401, May 2007.
- [19] J. Billy, V. Josse, Z. C. Zuo, A. Bernard, B. Hambrecht, P. Lugan, D. Clement, L. Sanchez-Palencia, P. Bouyer, and A. Aspect. Direct observation of Anderson localization of matter waves in a controlled disorder. *Nature*, 453(7197):891–894, June 2008.
- [20] C. Fort, L. Fallani, V. Guarrera, J. E. Lye, M. Modugno, D. S. Wiersma, and M. Inguscio. Effect of optical disorder and single defects on the expansion of a Bose-Einstein condensate in a one-dimensional waveguide. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95(17):170410, 2005.
- [21] E. Akkermans, S. Ghosh, and Z. H. Musslimani. Numerical study of one-dimensional and interacting Bose-Einstein condensates in a random potential. *J. Phys. B*, 41(4):045302, 2008.
- [22] T. Paul, P. Schlagheck, P. Leboeuf, and N. Pavloff. Superfluidity versus Anderson localization in a dilute Bose gas. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98(21):210602, 2007.
- [23] L. Beilin, E. Gurevich, and B. Shapiro. Diffusion of cold-atomic gases in the presence of an optical speckle potential. *Phys. Rev. A*, 81(3):033612, Mar 2010.
- [24] A. R. Bishop. *Fluctuation phenomena : disorder and nonlinearity*. World Scientific, Singapore ; River Edge, NJ, 1995.
- [25] K. O. Rasmussen, D. Cai, A. R. Bishop, and N. Gronbech-Jensen. Localization in a nonlinear disordered system. *Europhys. Lett.*, 47(4):421–427, 1999.
- [26] G. Kopidakis and S. Aubry. Intraband discrete breathers in disordered nonlinear systems. I. Delocalization. *Physica D*, 130(3-4):155–186, 1999.
- [27] G. Kopidakis and S. Aubry. Discrete breathers and delocalization in nonlinear disordered systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 84(15):3236–3239, 2000.

- [28] S. Fishman, Y. Krivolapov, and A. Soffer. The nonlinear schrödinger equation with random potential : Results and puzzles . arxiv:1108.2956 to be published in nonlinearity. 2011.
- [29] W.-M. Wang and Z. Zhang. Long time Anderson localization for nonlinear random Schrödinger equation. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 134:953, 2009.
- [30] W.-M. Wang. Logarithmic bounds on Sobolev norms for time dependent linear Schrödinger equations. *Comm. Part. Diff. Eq.*, 33(12):2164–2179, 2008.
- [31] S. Fishman, Y. Krivolapov, and A. Soffer. Perturbation theory for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a random potential. *Nonlinearity*, 22:2861–2887, 2009.
- [32] Y. Krivolapov, S. Fishman, and A. Soffer. A numerical and symbolical approximation of the nonlinear Anderson model. *New J. Phy.*, 12(6):063035, 2010.
- [33] A. Pikovsky and S. Fishman. Scaling properties of weak chaos in nonlinear disordered lattices. *Phys. Rev. E*, 83(2):025201, Feb 2011.
- [34] M. V Ivanchenko, T. V Laptjeva, and S. Flach. Anderson localization or nonlinear waves? a matter of probability. arXiv:1108.0899v1, 2011.
- [35] G. Benettin, J. Fröhlich, and A. Giorgilli. A Nekhoroshev-type theorem for Hamiltonian-systems with infinitely many degrees of freedom. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 119(1):95–108, 1988.
- [36] M. Johansson, G. Kopidakis, and S. Aubry. KAM tori in 1D random discrete nonlinear Schrödinger model? *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 91(5):50001, 2010.
- [37] D. M. Basko. Weak chaos in the disordered nonlinear Schrödinger chain: Destruction of Anderson localization by Arnold diffusion. *Annal. Phys.*, 326(7):1577–1655, 2011.
- [38] J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer, and C. E. Wayne. Localization in disordered, nonlinear dynamic-systems. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 42(3-4):247–274, 1986.
- [39] D. L. Shepelyansky. Delocalization of quantum chaos by weak nonlinearity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70(12):1787–1790, 1993.
- [40] A. S. Pikovsky and D. L. Shepelyansky. Destruction of Anderson localization by a weak nonlinearity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100(9):094101, 2008.
- [41] G. Kopidakis, S. Komineas, S. Flach, and S. Aubry. Absence of wave packet diffusion in disordered nonlinear systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100(8):084103, 2008.

- [42] M. I. Molina. Transport of localized and extended excitations in a nonlinear Anderson model. *Phys. Rev. B*, 58(19):12547–12550, 1998.
- [43] S. Flach, D. Krimer, and Ch. Skokos. Universal spreading of wavepackets in disordered nonlinear systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:024101, 2009.
- [44] C. Skokos, D.O. Krimer, Komineas, and S. S. Flach. Delocalization of wave packets in disordered nonlinear chains. *Phys. Rev. E*, 79:056211, 2009.
- [45] S. Fishman, Y. Krivolapov, and A. Soffer. On the problem of dynamical localization in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a random potential. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 131(5):843–865, 2008.
- [46] D. Basko. Weak chaos in the disordered nonlinear Schrödinger chain: Destruction of Anderson localization by Arnold diffusion. *Annal. Phys.*, 326:1577–1655, 2011.
- [47] B. Derrida and E. Gardner. Lyapounov exponent of the one dimensional anderson model : weak disorder expansions. *J. Phys. France*, 45(8):1283–1295, 1984.
- [48] A. MacKinnon and B. Kramer. One-parameter scaling of localization length and conductance in disordered systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 47(21):1546–1549, Nov 1981.