

Oscillation of the spin-currents of cold atoms on a ring due to light-induced spin-orbit coupling

WENFANG XIE¹, YANZHANG HE² and CHENGGUANG BAO² ^(a)

¹ *School of Physics and Electronic Engineering, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou 510006, People's Republic of China*

² *School of Physics and Engineering, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou 510275, People's Republic of China*

PACS 03.75.Kk – Dynamic properties of condensates; collective and hydrodynamic excitations, superfluid flow

PACS 03.75.Mn – Multicomponent condensates; spinor condensates

PACS 03.75.Nt – Other Bose-Einstein condensation phenomena

Abstract – The evolution of two-component cold atoms on a ring with quasispin-orbit coupling (qSO) and spin-flip has been studied analytically for the case with N noninteracting particles. Then, the effect of interaction is evaluated numerically via a two-body system. Oscillating persistent spin-currents have been found, and the underlying regularity governing the period and amplitude of the oscillation has been unveiled. A set of formulae have been derived to describe the oscillation so that the underlying physics can be understood in an analytical way. Based on these formulae the oscillation can be better controlled via adjusting the parameters of the laser beams.

It is well known that the study of the motion of charged particles under a magnetic field is an essential topic in both macroscopic and microscopic physics. In particular, a number of distinguished quantum mechanic phenomena, such as the Aharonov-Bohm (A-B) oscillation and the fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE), are caused by the magnetic gauge field. [1–4] After the experimental realization of the condensation of neutral atoms with nonzero spin, [5] a great interest is to create a light-induced gauge vector field so that various magnetic-electronic phenomena in condense matter can be copied in the condensates of neutral atoms. [1, 6] In recent years, by making use of the polarized laser beams, effective Lorentz force imposed on the multi-component neutral cold atoms can be created which leads to quasispin-orbit coupling (qSO). [7–12] This technique opens a new perspective in the field of BEC. In particular, the qSO will lead to the spin-Hall effect characterized by the persistent spin-currents. [6, 7] Recently, the oscillation of the spin-currents has been observed in a few experiments. [6, 7, 12] However, the underlying regularity has not yet been well understood.

On the other hand it is now possible to trap a condensate in a ring geometry. Long-lived rotational superflows have been induced in this kind of systems. [11, 13–20] Making use of the laser beams the creation and observation of the spin-currents on a ring has been experimentally realized. [11] It was found that the stability depends strongly on the initial ratio of the two components. [11], The underlying regularity remains to be studied.

^(a)The corresponding author: stsbcg@mail.sysu.edu.cn

This paper is dedicated to the two-component condensates on a ring under qSO. The aim is to clarify the regularity governing the oscillation of the spin-currents. The ring is considered as one-dimensional. When the interaction is not taken into account, analytical solution can be obtained so that the oscillation can be understood in an analytical way. The emphasis is placed on unveiling the regularity governing the period and amplitude of oscillation. Finally, the effect of the interaction is evaluated via a two-body system.

Let the quasi-spin \hat{s} be introduced to describe the two components of an atom as usual. The state with $s_z = 1/2$ ($-1/2$) is named the up- (down-) state denoted as ψ_\uparrow and $\psi_{\text{downarrow}}$, respectively. These two states can be transformed to each other via the Raman coupling. When two counter-propagating and polarized laser beams are applied, the two components of atoms will move towards opposite directions along the beams. The interaction is firstly neglected, its effect is evaluated later. Then, the hamiltonian is just $H = \sum_i \hat{h}_i$, where \hat{h}_i is for the i -th particle. We define a U -transformation so that $\phi_\uparrow = e^{i\beta\theta}\psi_\uparrow$ and $\phi_\downarrow = e^{-i\beta\theta}\psi_\downarrow$. For a one-dimensional ring the Hamiltonian for ϕ_\uparrow and ϕ_\downarrow is [1, 6, 7, 21, 22]

$$U\hat{h}U^{-1} = (-i\sigma_I \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} - \beta\sigma_z)^2 + \delta\sigma_z + \gamma\sigma_x \quad (1)$$

where θ is the azimuthal angle along the ring. The unit of energy is hereafter $E_{\text{unit}} \equiv \hbar^2/(2mR^2)$, where m is the mass of an atom, R is the radius of the ring. σ_I is just a unit matrix with rank 2. $\beta \equiv k_0 R$, where $2k_0$ is the momentum transfer caused by the two lasers. $\gamma \equiv \frac{\Omega}{2E_{\text{unit}}}$, where $\Omega/2$ is the strength of Raman coupling causing the spin-flips. $\delta \equiv \frac{\delta'}{2E_{\text{unit}}}$ is the Raman detuning, where $\delta' = \varepsilon_{\text{split}} - \hbar\omega_\delta$, $\varepsilon_{\text{split}}$ is the Zeeman energy difference between the two spin-states, and ω_δ is the frequency difference between the two laser beams. Note that, due to the ring geometry, β must be an integer. It implies that the transfer of momentum will be suppressed unless the momentum transfer is close to a specific set of values.

\hat{h} has two groups of eigenstates, they can be written as [7, 21, 22]

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_k^{(+)} &= \sin(\rho_k)e^{-i\beta\theta}\varphi_{k\uparrow} + \cos(\rho_k)e^{i\beta\theta}\varphi_{k\downarrow}, \\ \psi_k^{(-)} &= \cos(\rho_k)e^{-i\beta\theta}\varphi_{k\uparrow} - \sin(\rho_k)e^{i\beta\theta}\varphi_{k\downarrow}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where

$$\varphi_{k\uparrow} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{ik\theta} \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix}, \quad \varphi_{k\downarrow} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{ik\theta} \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{Bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

k is an \pm integer, $\sin\rho_k = s_\gamma\sqrt{(a_k - 2k\beta + \delta)/(2a_k)}$, $\cos\rho_k = \sqrt{(a_k + 2k\beta - \delta)/(2a_k)}$, s_γ is the sign of γ , $a_k = \sqrt{(2k\beta - \delta)^2 + \gamma^2}$, and ρ_k is ranged from $-\pi/2 \rightarrow \pi/2$. Note that ρ_k can be rewritten as a function of $|\gamma/(\delta - 2k\beta)|$ together with the signs of γ and $\delta - 2k\beta$. This feature is useful in the following discussion. The eigenenergies of $\psi_k^{(\pm)}$ are $E_k^{(\pm)} = k^2 + \beta^2 \pm a_k$. Obviously, $E_k^{(-)} \leq E_k^{(+)}$. Besides, $E_k^{(\pm)} = E_{-k}^{(\pm)}$ if $\delta = 0$.

The time-dependent solution $\psi(\theta, t)$ of the single-particle Schrödinger equation starting from an initial state ψ_{init} can be formally written as

$$\psi(\theta, t) = e^{-i\tau\hat{h}}\psi_{\text{init}} = \sum_{k\lambda} |\psi_k^{(\lambda)}\rangle e^{-i\tau E_k^{(\lambda)}} \langle \psi_k^{(\lambda)} | \psi_{\text{init}} \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\tau \equiv tE_{\text{unit}}/\hbar$ (for ^{87}Rb and $R = 12\mu\text{m}$ as given in [11], $t = 0.398\tau\text{sec}$), $\lambda = \pm$.

In the experiment reported in [12] the evolution was induced by a sudden change of the laser field, namely, by changing δ and/or γ . In this experiment a strong magnetization oscillation is reported. To give a better insight, it is assumed that a set of β , γ_1 , and δ_1 are given, and the system is initially at the ground state (g.s.), namely, $\psi_{\text{init}} = \psi_{\text{gs}} = \cos(\rho_q^{(1)})e^{-i\beta\theta}\varphi_{q\uparrow} - \sin(\rho_q^{(1)})e^{i\beta\theta}\varphi_{q\downarrow}$. Where q depends on the three parameters so that the

associated energy $E_q^{(-)}$ is the lowest. The superscript in $\rho_q^{(1)}$ implies that this quantity is calculated from the first set of parameters. Then, γ_1 and δ_1 are changed to γ_2 and δ_2 suddenly. Accordingly, we have a new set of eigenstates. With them $\psi(\theta, t)$ becomes

$$\psi(\theta, t) = e^{-i\tau(q^2 + \beta^2)}(f_u \varphi_{q-\beta, \uparrow} - f_d \varphi_{q+\beta, \downarrow}), \quad (5)$$

where $f_u = \cos(\rho_q^{(1)}) \cos(a_q^{(2)} \tau) + i \cos(2\rho_q^{(2)} - \rho_q^{(1)}) \sin(a_q^{(2)} \tau)$, and $f_d = \sin(\rho_q^{(1)}) \cos(a_q^{(2)} \tau) + i \sin(2\rho_q^{(2)} - \rho_q^{(1)}) \sin(a_q^{(2)} \tau)$. Where $a_q^{(2)}$ and $\rho_q^{(2)}$ are calculated from γ_2 and δ_2 . Let the time-dependent densities of the up- and down-component be defined from the identity $\psi^+(\theta, t)\psi(\theta, t) \equiv n_\uparrow(\theta, \tau) + n_\downarrow(\theta, \tau)$. Then, we have

$$n_\uparrow = \frac{1}{2\pi} \{ \cos^2(\rho_q^{(1)}) + [\cos^2(2\rho_q^{(2)} - \rho_q^{(1)}) - \cos^2(\rho_q^{(1)})] \sin^2(a_q^{(2)} \tau) \} \quad (6)$$

$$n_\downarrow = \frac{1}{2\pi} \{ \sin^2(\rho_q^{(1)}) + [\sin^2(2\rho_q^{(2)} - \rho_q^{(1)}) - \sin^2(\rho_q^{(1)})] \sin^2(a_q^{(2)} \tau) \}. \quad (7)$$

The magnetization (or spin-polarization) is defined as $P_z = (n_\uparrow - n_\downarrow)/(n_\uparrow + n_\downarrow)$, and we have

$$P_z = \cos(2\rho_q^{(1)}) + [\cos(4\rho_q^{(2)} - 2\rho_q^{(1)}) - \cos(2\rho_q^{(1)})] \sin^2(a_q^{(2)} \tau). \quad (8)$$

This formula originates from a single-particle Hamiltonian. For N-particle systems, when all the particles stay at the same state ψ_{gs} initially and the interaction is neglected, it is straight forward to prove that the above formula holds also. This formula gives a clear picture of a harmonic θ -independent oscillation with a period $\tau_p = \pi/a_q^{(2)}$ which depends only on the second set of parameters, and with an amplitude $A_{amp} = \cos(4\rho_q^{(2)} - 2\rho_q^{(1)}) - \cos(2\rho_q^{(1)})$. Obviously, when $\rho_q^{(1)} = \pi/2$ and $\rho_q^{(2)} = \pi/4$, $A_{amp} = 2$ and the amplitude arrives at its maximum. In general, when $\rho_q^{(1)}$ has been given and $\cos(2\rho_q^{(1)}) \geq 0$ (< 0), then A_{amp} will arrive at its conditional maximum at $\rho_q^{(2)} = \rho_q^{(1)}/2 + \pi/4$ ($\rho_q^{(1)}/2$). It implies that, when the first set of parameters are fixed, one can tune the second set so that A_{amp} is maximized. On the other hand, when $\rho_q^{(2)}$ is close to $\rho_q^{(1)}$, A_{amp} will be very small. This is obvious from the expression of A_{amp} .

From the definition of the current, we obtain that the up-current $j_\uparrow = j_{unit} n_\uparrow (q - \beta)$ and the down-current $j_\downarrow = j_{unit} n_\downarrow (q + \beta)$, where the unit of current is $j_{unit} = \hbar/(mR^2)$. The currents are also oscillating with the same period $\pi/a_q^{(2)}$, and they are also θ -independent. Obviously, when $|\beta| > |q|$, j_\uparrow and j_\downarrow have different signs, and counter propagating currents emerge.

To give numerical results, the radius is given at $R = 12\mu m$ in this paper. An example of the frequency $1/\tau_p = a_q^{(2)}/\pi$ is shown in Fig.1. From the definition of $a_q^{(2)}$ one can see that $1/\tau_p = 0$ when $\delta_2 = 2q\beta$ and $\gamma_2 = 0$. This minimum is shown at the left-down corner of Fig.1 where $\delta_2 = -18$. When γ_2 increases from zero and/or δ_2 goes away from $2q\beta$, the frequency will increase.

Two examples of A_{amp} are shown in Fig.2. When γ_2 is small and $\delta_2 \simeq 2q\beta$, there is a narrow domain in which A_{amp} is highly sensitive to δ_2 and varies as a sharp peak versus δ_2 . This is a distinguished feature. When γ_2 increases, the width of the peak becomes broader. The summit of the peak is marked by a dotted line.

Note that the first set of parameters are marked by a small circle in Fig.2. Around it there is a broad domain in which A_{amp} is very small (i.e., in which $\rho_q^{(2)} \simeq \rho_q^{(1)}$). In particular, the locations with $\rho_q^{(2)} = \rho_q^{(1)}$ are marked by a solid line passing through the small circle. Along this line $A_{amp} = 0$ and the sudden change of the laser field can not cause an oscillation. Note that, when the first set of parameters are fixed, A_{amp} is determined by $\rho_q^{(2)}$, and $\rho_q^{(2)}$ is in fact a function of $|\gamma_2/(\delta_2 - 2q\beta)|$ together with the signs of γ_2 and $\delta_2 - 2q\beta$. This explains that all the contours in Fig.2 are straight lines.




Fig. 1: The frequency $1/\tau_p$ versus δ_2 and γ_2 . The oscillation is caused by a sudden change in γ and δ . $\beta = 3$ and $q = -3$ are given. The minimum at which $1/\tau_p = 0$ is located at $\delta_2 = -18$ and $\gamma_2 = 0$. The values of the contours are in an arithmetic series. The contour closest to the right side has the largest value $1/\tau_p = 14.5$.

Recently, in an experiment of cold atoms with the ring geometry, [11] by making use of a radio frequency field, the initial state can be prepared in a superposition state

$$\psi_{init} = \sin(\phi/2)\varphi_{q\uparrow} + \cos(\phi/2)\varphi_{q\downarrow}, \quad (9)$$

where ϕ is tunable ($0 \leq \phi \leq \pi$) and determines the initial ratio of the two components. q is also tunable and is the initial angular momentum of the particle. In this case we have the set of parameters ϕ , q , β , γ , and δ . From Eq.(4) the time-dependent solution is

$$\psi(\theta, t) = e^{-i\tau(q^2+2\beta^2)}(f_{u_1}\varphi_{q,\uparrow} + f_{u_2}\varphi_{q-2\beta,\uparrow} + f_{d_1}\varphi_{q+2\beta,\downarrow} + f_{d_2}\varphi_{q,\downarrow}), \quad (10)$$

where

$$f_{u_1} = \sin(\phi/2)e^{-2iq\beta\tau}[\cos(a_{q+\beta}\tau) + i\cos(2\rho_{q+\beta})\sin(a_{q+\beta}\tau)], \quad (11)$$

$$f_{u_2} = -i\cos(\phi/2)e^{2iq\beta\tau}\sin(2\rho_{q-\beta})\sin(a_{q-\beta}\tau), \quad (12)$$

$$f_{d_1} = -i\sin(\phi/2)e^{-2iq\beta\tau}\sin(2\rho_{q+\beta})\sin(a_{q+\beta}\tau), \quad (13)$$

$$f_{d_2} = \cos(\phi/2)e^{2iq\beta\tau}[\cos(a_{q-\beta}\tau) - i\cos(2\rho_{q-\beta})\sin(a_{q-\beta}\tau)]. \quad (14)$$

Accordingly, we can obtain the up- and down-densities $n_{\uparrow}(\theta, \tau)$ and $n_{\downarrow}(\theta, \tau)$ given in the appendix. From them the magnetization P_z can be obtained. It turns out that, when $\phi = \pi$ or 0 (i.e., the atoms in ψ_{init} are purely up or purely down) the magnetization has a very




Fig. 2: The amplitude A_{amp} versus δ_2 and γ_2 . The oscillation is caused by a sudden change in γ and δ . $\beta = 3$, $\gamma_1 = 10$, and $\delta_1 = 5(-5)$, are given in a (b). Accordingly, the ground state has $q = -3(3)$ in a (b). The dotted lines mark the conditional maximum of $A_{amp} = 1.917$ in both (a) and (b) (the largest value in each panel). The contours going away from this line are in an arithmetic series and decrease to zero. The black small circle marks the location where $\delta_2 = \delta_1$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1$. The solid line passing through the circle marks the locations where $\rho_q^{(2)} = \rho_q^{(1)}$ and accordingly $A_{amp} = 0$.




Fig. 3: The amplitude A_{amp} versus δ and γ for the case that the initial state is a superposition state. $q = 3$ and $\beta = 2$ are assumed. The dotted line marks the maximum of $A_{amp} = 2$. The locations with $\gamma = 0$ have $A_{amp} = 0$.




Fig. 4: The magnetization P_z versus τ observed at $\theta = 0$. The initial state is a superposition state with a ϕ marked by the curve. $q = 3$, $\beta = 2$, $\gamma = 15$, and $\delta = 20$ are assumed. When $\phi = \pi$ or 0 the oscillation is harmonic. Otherwise, it is not.

simple form as

$$P_z = \cos(4\rho_{q+\beta}) + (1 - \cos(4\rho_{q+\beta})) \cos^2(a_{q+\beta}\tau), \quad (\text{if } \phi = \pi), \quad (15)$$

$$P_z = -\cos(4\rho_{q-\beta}) - (1 - \cos(4\rho_{q-\beta})) \cos^2(a_{q-\beta}\tau), \quad (\text{if } \phi = 0). \quad (16)$$

As before, when all the particles stay in the same ψ_{init} initially and the interaction is neglected, the above formulae hold also for N-particle systems. They give also a clear picture of harmonic oscillation, but the periods are different for the two cases of ϕ .

When $\phi = \pi$, $\tau_p = \pi/a_{q+\beta}$. If δ is tuned so that $\delta = 2\beta(q + \beta) \equiv \delta_o$, the frequency $1/\tau_p$ will be minimized. When δ goes away from δ_o , the frequency increases. The amplitude $A_{amp} = 1 - \cos(4\rho_{q+\beta})$. Obviously, when $\rho_{q+\beta} = \pm\pi/4$, A_{amp} arrives at its maximum 2. This maximal oscillation can be achieved when $\delta \rightarrow 2(q + \beta)\beta$ or $|\gamma| \rightarrow \infty$. Whereas when $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, we always have $A_{amp} \rightarrow 0$ and the oscillation does not appear. Thus γ is the source of the oscillation.

When $\phi = 0$, the discussion in the preceding paragraph holds also except that $q + \beta$ should be changed to $q - \beta$. An example of A_{amp} is shown in Fig.3.

When ϕ is neither π nor 0 , the oscillation is no more harmonic. In particular, both the up- and down-densities depend on θ (refer to the appendix). Consequently, there are stripes emerge along the ring, and the stripes move with time. An example of the evolution of P_z is shown in Fig.4. Where the curve with $\phi = \pi$ has $A_{amp} = 2$, while the curve with $\phi = 0$ has a much smaller A_{amp} (the small amplitude is caused by the choice of the parameters, refer to Fig.3). For $\phi = \pi/2$, the anharmonic oscillation is shown.

An example of the up-density with $\phi = \pi/2$ is shown in Fig.5, where the stripes emerging along the ring are shown. Note that two waves are contained in each component (say, the up-component is a mixture of $\varphi_{q,\uparrow}$ and $\varphi_{q-2\beta,\uparrow}$). The stripes arise from the interference of these two waves. The number of peaks (valleys) is 2β (say, the number is four in Fig.5). Their locations and clarity vary with time.




Fig. 5: Up-density n_{\uparrow} versus θ with $\phi = \pi/2$. The densities are given by 20 curves for a sequence of τ . Starting from $\tau = 0$, in each step τ is increased by $1/40$. The 20 curves in the sequence are divided into 4 groups. The n_{\uparrow} of each group has been shifted up by 2 relative to its preceding group, this is just for guiding the eyes. The five n_{\uparrow} in each group are plotted in solid, dash, dash-dot, dash-dot-dot, and dot lines, respectively, according to the time-sequence (say, the one with $\tau = 0$ is the horizontal solid line in the lowest group). The parameters are $q = 1$, $\beta = 2$, $\gamma = 10$, and $\delta = 1$. The vertical dotted lines are also for guiding the eyes.

When the interaction is taken into account, the total Hamiltonian is $H = \sum_i \hat{h}_i + \sum_{i < j} V_{ij}$, where $V_{ij} = g\delta(\theta_i - \theta_j)$, $g = g_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ (if both atoms are up), $g_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ (both down), or $g_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ (one up and one down). In order to evaluate the effect of interaction in a simplest way, we study a two-body system. Firstly, the set of single particle states $\varphi_{k\uparrow}$ and $\varphi_{k\downarrow}$ are adopted. A constraint $-k_{\max} \leq k \leq k_{\max}$ is set. Accordingly, we have $2(2k_{\max} + 1)$ single particle states, and they are renamed as $\varphi_j \equiv \varphi_{k_j\mu_j}$ ($\mu_j = \uparrow$ or \downarrow). Based on φ_j a set of basis functions for the two-body system $\Phi_i = \tilde{S}[\varphi_j(1)\varphi_{j'}(2)]$ are defined, where \tilde{S} is for the symmetrization and normalization, and $j \geq j'$.

Note that the strength of a pair of realistic Rb atoms is $g_{Rb} = 7.79 \times 10^{-12} H_Z cm^3$ (the differences in the strengths between the up-up, up-down, and down-down pairs are very small and are therefore neglected). Since the atoms in related experiments are not really distributed exactly on a one-dimensional ring but in a domain surrounding the ring, the effect of the diffused distribution should be considered. Hence, for each $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{ik\theta}$, we define its 3-dimensional counterpart $\frac{1}{\pi r_w} \sqrt{\frac{1}{R}} e^{ik\theta} e^{-(r/r_w)^2}$, where the Gaussian function $e^{-(r/r_w)^2}$ describes the diffused distribution and r_w measures the width of the distribution. Accordingly, for each $\varphi_{k\mu}$, we have its counterpart $\varphi_{k\mu}^{[3d]}$. With $\varphi_{k\mu}^{[3d]}$ we define an effective strength g_{eff} so that for any pair of matrix elements




Fig. 6: P_z of a 2-body system of Rb atoms versus τ with interaction. $r_w = R/\sqrt{18}$ and $g_{\uparrow\uparrow} = g_{\downarrow\downarrow} = g_{\uparrow\downarrow} = g$ are assumed. The solid, dash, and dash-dot curves have $g = 0$, $100g_{eff}$, and $2000g_{eff}$, respectively. The initial state has $\phi = \pi$ (a) and 0 (b). The other parameters are the same as in Fig.4

$$\begin{aligned}
 & g_{eff} \int d\theta_i d\theta_j \varphi_{k_1\mu_1}^\dagger \varphi_{k_2\mu_2}^\dagger \delta(\theta_i - \theta_j) \varphi_{k_3\mu_3} \varphi_{k_4\mu_4} \\
 &= g_{Rb} \int d\mathbf{r}_i d\mathbf{r}_j \varphi_{k_1\mu_1}^{[3d]\dagger} \varphi_{k_2\mu_2}^{[3d]\dagger} \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \varphi_{k_3\mu_3}^{[3d]} \varphi_{k_4\mu_4}^{[3d]}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Then, we have $g_{eff} = \frac{1}{\pi R r_w^2} g_{Rb}$ which is the strength adopted in our calculation.

It is assumed that each of the two atoms is given in a superposition state with either $\phi = \pi$ or 0 initially. When the Hamiltonian is diagonalized in the space expanded by Φ_i , the eigenenergies E_l and eigenstates $\Psi_l \equiv \sum_i C_{li} \Phi_i$ can be obtained, and the time-dependent state is

$$\Psi(\theta, t) = \sum_l e^{-i\tau E_l} \Psi_l \langle \Psi_l | \Psi_{init} \rangle. \tag{18}$$

From $\Psi(\theta, t)$ the densities and $P_z(t)$ can be calculated. An examples with $k_{\max} = 14$ is shown in Fig.6. When k_{\max} is changed from 14 to 12, there is no explicit changes in the pattern. It implies that the choice $k_{\max} = 14$ is sufficient in qualitative sense. In Fig.6 the curves "1" and "2" overlap nearly. It implies that the effect of interaction with a $g < 100g_{eff}$ is very small. Thus the effect of interaction for the two-body system with $R = 12\mu m$ is negligible.

However, when $g = 2000g_{eff}$, the amplitude decreases with time explicitly as shown by the dash-dot curve, while the period remains nearly unchanged.

Note that the effect of interaction depends also on the particle density. For a N-body system with a larger N (or the ring becomes smaller) the effect would become stronger. The phenomenon shown by the dash-dot curve has already been observed in existing experiments for N-body condensates. [7, 12] It is possible that the qualitative features of the oscillations of a many-body system and a few-body system with a stronger strength would be more or less similar. This is a topic to be studied further.

In summary, the oscillation of the cold atoms under the qSO and constrained on a ring is studied analytically for arbitrary N without interactions. Then, the effect of the interaction is evaluated numerically via a two-body system. Two cases, namely, the evolution starting from a ground state induced by a sudden change of the laser field, and the evolution starting from a superposition state, have been studied. The emphasis is placed on clarifying the relation between the parameters of the laser beams (causing the qSO) and the period and amplitude of the oscillation. This is achieved by giving a set of formulae so that the relation can be understood analytically. It has been predicted that, under certain conditions, the oscillation can be maximized or minimized, and oscillating counter-propagating currents will emerge. Experimental confirmation of the regularity unveiled in this paper is expected.

* * *

The support from the NSFC (China) under the grant number 10874249 is appreciated.

APPENDIX

When the initial state is $\psi_{init} = \sin(\phi/2)\varphi_{q\uparrow} + \cos(\phi/2)\varphi_{q\downarrow}$, the associated up- and down-densities during the evolution are

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\uparrow}(\theta, \tau) = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \{ \sin^2(\phi/2) [\cos^2(a_{q+\beta}\tau) + \cos^2(2\rho_{q+\beta}) \sin^2(a_{q+\beta}\tau)] \\ & + \cos^2(\phi/2) \sin^2(2\rho_{q-\beta}) \sin^2(a_{q-\beta}\tau) \\ & - \sin\phi \sin(2\rho_{q-\beta}) \sin(a_{q-\beta}\tau) [\cos(2\beta\theta - 4q\beta\tau) \cos(2\rho_{q+\beta}) \sin(a_{q+\beta}\tau) \\ & + \sin(2\beta\theta - 4q\beta\tau) \cos(a_{q+\beta}\tau)] \}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\downarrow}(\theta, \tau) = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \{ \cos^2(\phi/2) [\cos^2(a_{q-\beta}\tau) + \cos^2(2\rho_{q-\beta}) \sin^2(a_{q-\beta}\tau)] \\ & + \sin^2(\phi/2) \sin^2(2\rho_{q+\beta}) \sin^2(a_{q+\beta}\tau) \\ & + \sin\phi \sin(2\rho_{q+\beta}) \sin(a_{q+\beta}\tau) [\cos(2\beta\theta - 4q\beta\tau) \cos(2\rho_{q-\beta}) \sin(a_{q-\beta}\tau) \\ & + \sin(2\beta\theta - 4q\beta\tau) \cos(a_{q-\beta}\tau)] \}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] ZHAI H., *arXiv:1403.8021v1*, (2014) .
- [2] AHARONOV Y. and BOHM D., *Phys. Rev.*, **115** (1959) 485.
- [3] TSUI D.C., STORMER H.L. and GOSSARD A.C., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **48** (1982) 1559.
- [4] LAUGHLIN R.B., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **50** (1983) 1395.
- [5] STENGER J., ET AL., *Nature*, **396** (1998) 345.
- [6] ZHU S.L., FU H., WU C.J., ZHANG S.C. and DUAN L.M., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **97** (2006) 240401.
- [7] LIN Y.-J., COMPTON R.L., PERRY A.R., PHILLIPS W.D., PORTO J.V. and SPIELMAN I.B., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **102** (2009) 130401.
- [8] LIN Y.-J. , COMPTON R.L., JIMÉNEZ-GARCÍA K., PORTO J.V. and SPIELMAN I.B., *Nature(London)*, **462** (2009) 628.

- [9] LIN Y.-J., COMPTON R.L., JIMÉNEZ-GARCÍA K., PHILLIPS W.D., PORTO J.V. and SPIELMAN I.B., *Nat. Phys.*, **7** (2011) 531.
- [10] LIN Y.-J., JIMÉNEZ-GARCÍA K. and SPIELMAN I.B., *Nature(London)*, **471** (2011) 83.
- [11] BEATTIE S., MOULDER S., FLETCHER R.J. and HADZIBABIC Z., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **110** (2013) 025301.
- [12] ZHANG J.Y., ET AL., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **109** (2012) 115301.
- [13] GUPTA S., MURCH K.W., MOORE K.L., PURDY T.P. and STAMPER-KURN D.M., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **95** (2005) 143201.
- [14] ARNOLD A.S., GARVIE C.S. and RIIS E., *Phys. Rev. A*, **73** (2006) 041606.
- [15] RYU C., ANDERSEN M.F., CLADÉ P., NATARAJAN V., HELMERSON K. and PHILLIPS W.D., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **99** (2007) 260401.
- [16] HENDERSON K., RYU C., MACCORMICK C. and BOSHIER M.G., *New J. Phys.*, **11** (2009) 043030.
- [17] RAMANATHAN A., WRIGHT K.C., MUNIZ S.R., ZELAN M., HILL W.T., LOBB C.J., HELMERSON K., PHILLIPS W.D. and CAMPBELL G.K., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **106** (2011) 130401.
- [18] SHERLOCK B.E., GILDEMEISTER M., OWEN E., NUGENT E. and FOOT C.J., *Phys. Rev. A*, **83** (2011) 043408.
- [19] MOULDER S., BEATTIE S., SMITH R.P., TAMMUZ N. and HADZIBABIC Z., *Phys. Rev. A*, **86** (2012) 013629.
- [20] WRIGHT K.C., BLAKASTAL R.B., LOBB C.J., PHILLIPS W.P. and CAMPBELL G.K., *arXiv:1208.3608*, **2012** (.)
- [21] ZHENG W. and LI Z.B., *Phys. Rev. A*, **85** (2012) 2012.
- [22] LI Y., MARTONE G.I., PITAEVSKII L.P. and STRINGARI S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **110** (2013) 235302.