Fermionic vs bosonic two-site Hubbard models with a pair of interacting cold atoms
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In a recent work, Murmann et al. [Phys. Rev. Lett. \textbf{114}, 080402 (2015)] have experimentally prepared and manipulated a double-well optical potential containing a pair of Fermi atoms as a possible building block of Hubbard model. Here, we carry out a comparative theoretical study on fermionic vs. bosonic two-site Hubbard models with a pair of interacting atoms in a double-well potential. The fermionic atoms are considered to be of two-component type. We show that, given the same input parameters for both bosonic and fermionic two-site Hubbard models, many of the statistical properties such as the single- and double-occupancy of a site, and the probabilities for the single-particle and pair tunneling are similar in both cases. But, the fluctuation quantities such as number and phase fluctuations are markedly different for the two cases. We treat the bosonic and fermionic phase variables in terms of the quantum mechanical phase operators of bosonic and fermionic matter-waves, respectively. Furthermore, we examine whether it is possible to account for the Feshbach-resonant atom-atom interactions into the models through the finite-ranged model interaction potentials of Jost and Kohn.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Ultracold atoms in optical lattices have become a testing ground for quantum many-body physics. In this context, a paradigmatic model is the Hubbard model that introduced more than fifty years ago to describe the behavior of strongly correlated electrons, and Mott-insulator transition in crystalline solids. After the discovery of high-temperature superconductivity in cuprate solids in 80s, it is believed that the model can capture some of the essential aspects of such superconducting phase. In late 80s and early 90s, a bosonic version of the model was formulated to account for superfluid-to-Mott insulator transition in bosonic lattice systems. With the recent advent of laser-generated optical lattices that provide a pristine crystalline structure for ultracold atoms, both Fermi- and Bose-Hubbard models have attracted renewed interests, enabling experimenters to realize atomic Bose-Hubbard model, to demonstrate superfluid-to-Mott insulator transition of Bose-condensed atoms, Fermi surfaces and Fermi-Hubbard model for ultracold fermionic atoms, etc.

One can engineer optical lattice structure with a lot of control over its parameters by external fields. Moreover, the interactions between atoms can be tuned by magnetically controlled Feshbach resonances, unlike those between electrons in solids. These features make an optical lattice a possible quantum simulator for many-body quantum systems - a long-sought goal first theoretically envisioned by Feynman. Towards this endeavor, a unique system is the optically or magnetically generated double wells or double-well (DW) lattices which have enabled experimental realizations of a number of correlation effects such as highly controllable second order tunneling and entanglement between isolated atom pairs. About a decade ago, Bloch’s group experimentally realized a two-site version of Bose-Hubbard model with a pair of bosonic atoms in two different spin states in a double well and thus demonstrated time-resolved controlled superexchange interaction. Recently, Murmann et al. have shown a crucial step towards realizing Hubbard model from a bottom-up approach, by preparing and controlling the quantum states of a pair of interacting two-component fermionic $^6$Li atoms in a single double-well optical micropotential. A DW trap loaded with ultracold atoms under tight-binding approximation is considered as a two-site Hubbard model - a possible building block for creating a full-fledged Hubbard model form a bottom-up approach.

We here carry out a detailed model study on the physical and dynamical properties of a pair of interacting atoms in a DW potential. Our purpose is two-fold. First, we address ourselves how external field-controlled resonant two-body interactions can influence the underlying parameters of a DW optical lattice. Second, we perform a comparative study between bosonic and fermionic two-site Hubbard models with a pair of atoms interacting with an arbitrary range and a large scattering length. Using a model DW potential, we calculate the tunneling coupling $J$, on-site and inter-site interaction parameters $U$ and $U_i$, respectively, for two-body resonant interactions near Feshbach resonances. We wish to verify whether the usual two-mode approximation of Hubbard models holds good for resonant interactions. Our results show that for broad resonances with small effective range, two-mode approximation holds good. However, for narrow resonances, this approximation may break down. For large effective range or for a long-range interaction, the inter-site interaction is found to be important.

To model the $s$-wave interaction between the atoms, we consider finite-range model potentials derived by Jost and Kohn in the context of nuclear physics. The significance of these Jost-Kohn potentials is that they can
2. BUILDING UP THE MODELS: TWO ATOMS IN A DOUBLE WELL

This section describes how to build-up the models with a pair of interacting atoms in a DW potential. We consider a 3D trapping potential of the form

\[ V_{\text{trap}}(r) = \frac{1}{2} m \omega_r^2 \rho^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \left( z^2 - \eta^2 \right)^2 \]

which has harmonic oscillations along radial directions (\(x\)- and \(y\)-axes) and a DW along \(z\)-axis. Here \(\rho^2 = x^2 + y^2\), \(\omega_r\) is radial trapping frequency, \(z = \pm \eta\) are the two minimum points where the trapping potential along the \(z\)-axis vanishes and the barrier height of the DW is \(V_0 = \frac{1}{2} \lambda \eta^4\). If \(V_0\) is very large compared to the ground-state energy, each well will behave like an almost independent harmonic oscillator. Under this harmonic approximation, the harmonic frequency \(\omega_z = \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{\eta m}}\). We assume that the temperature is low enough so that the atoms occupy only the ground state of the radial harmonic potentials even in the strong atom-atom interaction regime.

We further assume that the aspect ratio \(\sqrt{\omega_z/\omega_r} << 1\). Then integrating over the radial harmonic oscillator states, one can obtain an effective 1D Hamiltonian for the system. We solve for single-particle 1D eigenfunctions and eigenvalues numerically using the method of discrete variable representation (DVR). The lowest two energy eigenfunctions being quasi-degenerate, atoms can only occupy this ground “band” in the presence of particle-particle interaction. For symmetric DW, the lowest eigenstate \(\psi_+(z)\) is space-symmetric (\(\psi_+(z) = \psi_+(−z)\)) and the other quasi-degenerate state \(\psi_-(z)\) is antisymmetric (\(\psi_-(z) = −\psi_+(-z)\)). Under tight-binding approximation, one can form two-mode basis states \(\psi_{\pm}(z) = \left[\psi_+(z) ± \psi_-(z)\right]/\sqrt{2}\) which are localized either on the left or right well of the DW. Let us rename \(\psi_l = \psi_+(z)\) as the left-well localized state and \(\psi_r = \psi_-(z)\) as the right localized state. We then obtain the tunnel coupling \(J\) by calculating the matrix element \(−\hbar J = \int d\mathbf{r} \psi_l(\mathbf{r}) H_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_r(\mathbf{r})\), where \(H_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{r})\) is the 1D single-particle Hamiltonian with \(V_{\text{dw}}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda \eta^2 (z^2 - \eta^2)^2\) being the DW potential and \(m\) being the mass of the particle.

In terms of the localized basis functions, there are in general three coefficients of interaction

\[ U_{ij} = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 |\Phi_i(\mathbf{r}_1)|^2 V_{\text{int}}(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|)|\Phi_j(\mathbf{r}_2)|^2 \]

where ‘\(i\)’ and ‘\(j\)’ stand for the site index ‘\(l\)’ (left) and ‘\(r\)’ (right), \(\Phi_i(\mathbf{r})\) is the ground state of 2D harmonic oscillator wave function of \(j\)th particle, \(V_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)\) denotes the interaction potential between the two particles ‘\(l\)’ and ‘\(r\)’. In case of symmetric DW, there are only two possible interaction parameters, namely, the on-site interaction \(U = U_{ll} = U_{rr}\) and the inter-site interaction \(U_{lr} = U_{rl}\). For a pair of weakly interacting spherically symmetric atoms in ground states at low energy, \(V_{\text{int}}(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|)\) can be replaced by delta function contact potential of the form \(V_{\text{contact}} = \frac{4\pi \hbar^2 a_s}{m} \delta(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|)\). In that case, \(U_{ij}\) vanishes and there remains only one interaction parameter \(U\). But for finite-range and long-range interaction potentials, \(U_{ij}\) is finite. For an effective interaction near Feshbach resonances, \(a_s\) diverges; and the effective range \(r_0\) of interaction becomes finite, particularly near a narrow Feshbach resonance \(r_0\) may become quite large. In such situations, contact potential approximation breaks down, necessitating the use of a non-contact or finite-range effective interaction. Hubbard model relies on two-mode approximation which remains valid so long as the interaction energy is much smaller than the gap between lowest and first excited energy band. Since near a Feshbach resonance, the atoms become strongly interacting, the question naturally arises whether the two-mode approximation holds good near Feshbach resonances. Since one of the purposes of our work is to examine the Hubbard models with finite-range interactions, we make use of the model interaction potentials derived by Jost and Kohn [18]. Though these potentials are known in nuclear and atomic physics [20], they are not well-known in the con-
text cold atom physics. We therefore make a digression here to elaborate on these potentials to some extent.

2.1. Finite-range model interaction potentials of Jost and Kohn

To examine whether resonant interactions can be fit into Hubbard models, we make use of the finite-range interaction potentials of Jost and Kohn in building up the models. The form of the Jost-Kohn potential for positive s-wave scattering length $a_s$ is different from that for negative $a_s$. The one for positive $a_s$, is a three-parameter potential with the parameters being $a_s$, the effective range $r_0$ and another parameter $\Lambda$ which is related to the binding energy of the last bound state close to the threshold of the actual two-body interaction potential. The other one for negative $a_s$ is a two-parameter potential with the parameter being $a_s$ and $r_0$ only. The reason for this difference between the two potentials is that a large positive $a_s$ implies the existence of a bound state which can significantly influence the amplitude of scattering between the two atoms. In contrast, when $a_s$ is negative there does not exist any bound state near the threshold. Near Feshbach resonances, the effective range may become finite and magnetic field-dependent as shown in recent theoretical and experimental works [21, 22]. For trapped atoms, even in the weak interaction regime, the results for contact interaction are reproducible only when the trap is isotropic or weakly anisotropic [23, 24]. In case of strongly anisotropic traps such as quasi-one or quasi-two dimensional traps, the results with a finite-range interaction deviate significantly from those with a contact potential [23]. Since quasi-one dimensional DW trap is essentially an anisotropic trap, Jost-Kohn potentials would be a natural choice to model interactions for ultracold atoms in such a trap. We find that, for large effective range or long range, in a symmetric DW trap, inter-site interaction $U_i$ is not negligible compared to the on-site interaction $U$ and the tunneling coupling $J$.

Let us first discuss the three-parameter model interaction potential [18] for positive $a_s$ with a bound state. The s-wave binding energy is $E_b = -\hbar^2 \kappa^2 / 2\mu$ ($\kappa > 0$), where $\mu$ is reduced mass and

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{r_0} \frac{1 + \alpha}{1 - \Lambda}$$

(3)

where $-1 < \Lambda < 1$, $\alpha = \sqrt{1 - 2r_0/a_s}$ and $a_s > 2r_0$ for $r_0 > 0$. In terms of $a_s$, $r_0$ and $\Lambda$, the potential is

$$V_+(r) = \frac{8\hbar^2}{\mu r_0^2} e^{-2(1-\alpha)\frac{r}{\Lambda}} (1 + \alpha\Lambda)^2 (\alpha + \Lambda)^2 (-1 - \Lambda^2 e^{-2(1+\alpha)\frac{r}{r_0}}) - \Lambda^2 (1 + \alpha)^2$$

(4)
smooth function of magnetic field. In that case the coupled channel calculations of Ref. [21] agree well with Gao’s formula [25]. However, near zero crossing of $a_s$ close to 527 G for $^6$Li, it diverges to negative side. The magnetic field dependence of $a_s$ near the resonant magnetic field $B = B_0$ is given by

$$a_s = a_{bg} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta}{B - B_0} \right)$$

where $a_{bg}$ is the background scattering length and $\Delta$ is the width of zero crossing. For calculating $U$ and $U_i$ using Jost-Kohn interaction potentials for our model DW potential, we choose values of $r_0$ and $\Delta$ same as given in Ref. [21] for one broad resonance at the magnetic field $B_0 = 832$ G, and for another narrow resonance at $B_0 = 543.4$ G. The values of other parameters at the resonances are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$B_0 (G)$</th>
<th>$\Delta (G)$</th>
<th>$a_{bg}$ (a$_0$)</th>
<th>$r_0$ (a$_0$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>-1593</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-71000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: Parameters for our calculations for different resonances. $B_0$ is the magnetic field in Gauss (G) at resonance, $\Delta$ is resonance width in G, $a_{bg}$ is background scattering length in Bohr radius a$_0$. These data are taken from Ref. [21].

In Fig. 1 we have shown the variation of $U$ and $U_i$ near the resonance with $B_0 = 832$ G. The plot indicates that, at very large positive $a_s$ ($B < B_0$), both $U$ and $U_i$ vary nonlinearly and change sign near resonance. On the other hand, in the large negative $a_s$ regime ($B > B_0$), both $U$ and $U_i$ are negative and vary almost linearly with $B$.

For narrow Feshbach resonance though, the value of $U$, as shown Fig. 2, is so large that two-mode approximation breaks down, since the gap between the two lowest energy bands is calculated to be about 8 kHz. Furthermore, $U_i$ is also relatively large and cannot be neglected in this case. As a function of $a_s$ or $B$, $U$ is discontinuous at the resonance.

3. TWO-ATOM TWO-SITE HUBBARD MODELS AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

In this section, we present analytical solutions for both fermionic and bosonic two-site Hubbard models.

3.1. Fermions

Let us consider a pair of two-component fermions in a DW potential under tight-binding approximation. Let the two components be denoted by the spin states $| \uparrow \rangle$ and $| \downarrow \rangle$. The Hamiltonian of the system in localized basis...
\[ H = -Jh(\hat{a}_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\uparrow} + \hat{a}_{l\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\downarrow} + \hat{a}_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\downarrow} + \hat{a}_{r\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\downarrow}) \\
+ U_l h \hat{a}_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\downarrow} \hat{a}_{l\uparrow} + U_r h \hat{a}_{r\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\downarrow} \hat{a}_{r\uparrow} \\
+ \frac{1}{2} (U_r - U_l) h (\hat{a}_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\uparrow} \hat{a}_{r\uparrow} + \hat{a}_{l\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\downarrow} \hat{a}_{r\downarrow} + \hat{a}_{r\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\downarrow} \hat{a}_{l\downarrow} + \hat{a}_{r\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\uparrow} \hat{a}_{l\uparrow}) \]

(7)

where \( J \) is tunnel coupling, \( U_l \) and \( U_r \) are the left and right on-site interaction in the left and right well, respectively and \( U_{l,r} = U_d = U \) is inter-site interaction. Here \( \hat{a}_{\sigma}(\hat{a}_{\sigma}^\dagger) \) represents annihilation (creation) operator of a fermion in site \( s (l, r) \) and spin state \( \sigma (\uparrow, \downarrow) \). For a symmetrical DW, \( U_l = U_r = U \) where \( U \) is the common on-site interaction. There are four localized basis states \( |\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow\uparrow, 0\rangle, \) and \( |0, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle \), where, the state \( |\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle \) and \( |0, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle \) represent two fermions in the left and right well, respectively; \( |\sigma, \sigma'\rangle \) represents two fermions are in two different wells. Using these bases, the Hamiltonian for a symmetrical DW can be written in a matrix form

\[ H_F = \hbar \begin{bmatrix} U & -J & -J & 0 \\ -J & U_l & 0 & -J \\ -J & 0 & U_r & -J \\ 0 & -J & -J & U \end{bmatrix} \]

(8)

Let the four eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian be denoted by \( E_a, E_b, E_c, \) and \( E_d \), with corresponding eigen functions \( |a\rangle, |b\rangle, |c\rangle \) and \( |d\rangle \), respectively. Let \( U_{\pm} = (U \pm U_l) \) and \( \Omega = \sqrt{U_l^2 + 16J^2} \). Explicitly, the eigenvalues are given by

\[ E_a = \frac{1}{2} (U_+ - \Omega), \]

(9)

\[ E_b = \frac{1}{2} (U_+ + \Omega), \]

(10)

\[ E_c = U, \text{ and } E_d = U_l. \]

Clearly, \( E_a \) and \( E_c \) are the lowest and highest energy eigenvalues. The corresponding eigen functions are given by

\[ |a\rangle = \frac{4J}{\sqrt{16J^2 + (U_+ + \Omega)^2}} (|+\rangle + \frac{U_- + \Omega}{4J}|t\rangle) \]

(11)

\[ |b\rangle = |-\rangle \]

(12)

\[ |c\rangle = \frac{4J}{\sqrt{16J^2 + (U_+ - \Omega)^2}} (|+\rangle + \frac{U_- - \Omega}{4J}|t\rangle) \]

(13)

\[ |d\rangle = |s\rangle \]

(14)

where \( |t\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\uparrow\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle), |s\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle), \) and \( |\pm\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\uparrow\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle \pm |\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle) \).

We next calculate the dynamical evolution of the system from an initial state which is not an eigen state of the system. Let the time-dependent wave function be expressed as \( |\psi_F\rangle = C_- (t) |t\rangle - C_+ (t) |t\rangle + C_+ (t) |t\rangle + C_- (t) |t\rangle = |\psi_F\rangle = c_0(t) |\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + c_1(t) |\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + c_2(t) |\downarrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + c_3(t) |0, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle \)

where \( c_i(t) (i = 0, 1, 2, 3) \) and \( C_s (s = \pm, t) \) are the probability amplitude for the respective state. For the initial condition: \( c_0(0) = 1, c_1(0) = 0, c_2(0) = 0 \) and \( c_3(0) = 0 \) i.e., both particles are initially in the left site, we obtain

\[ C_- (t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \exp[-iUt] \]

(15)

\[ C_+ (t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \exp[-iU_{\pm}t/2] \left\{ \frac{1}{\Omega} \left[ \frac{\Omega t}{2} \cos \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \right] \right\} \]

(16)

\[ C_+ (t) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}iJ}{\Omega} \exp[-iU_{\pm}t/2] \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \]

(17)

The coefficients \( c_i \) are related to \( C_\pm \) and \( C_t \) by \( c_0(t) = [C_-(t) + C_+(t)]/\sqrt{2}, c_1(t) = c_2(t) = C_t(t)/\sqrt{2} \) and \( c_3 = [-C_-(t) + C_+(t)]/\sqrt{2} \). If the system is initialized in \( |t\rangle \), that is, for the initial condition: \( c_0(0) = 0, c_1(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, c_2(0) = 0 \) and \( c_3(0) = 0 \), we have \( C_- (t) = 0, c_0(t) = c_3(t) = 0 \). The other coefficients are calculated.

\[ E = U - b \]

(10)

\[ \psi_F = 0.5 \left( |\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow, 0\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow, 0\rangle + |0, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle \right) \]

(14)

\[ |\psi_F\rangle = c_0(t) |\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + c_1(t) |\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + c_2(t) |\downarrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + c_3(t) |0, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle \]

(17)
\[ C_+(t) / \sqrt{2} \text{ and } C_1(t) = C_2(t) = C_+(t) / \sqrt{2}, \] where

\[ C_+(t) = \frac{4iJ}{\Omega} \exp[-iU_+ t/2] \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \] (18)

\[ C_i(t) = \frac{1}{\Omega} \exp[-iU_+ t/2] \left\{ \Omega \cos \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) + iU_- \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \right\} \] (19)

### 3.2. Bosons

The Hamiltonian in the localized basis is

\[ \hat{H}_B = -J(\hat{a}^\dagger_r \hat{a}_r + \hat{a}^\dagger_l \hat{a}_l) + \frac{U_l}{2} \hat{a}^\dagger_l \hat{a}^2_l \right) + \frac{U_r}{2} \left( \hat{a}^\dagger_r \hat{a}_r + \hat{a}^\dagger_r \hat{a}_r \right) \]

For boson system, the Fock state basis are \( |2,0\rangle, |1,1\rangle \) and \( |0,2\rangle\). The Hamiltonian in these bases can be expressed in the matrix form

\[ H_B = \hbar \begin{pmatrix} U & -J \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ -J \sqrt{2} & U_i & -J \sqrt{2} \\ 0 & -J \sqrt{2} & U \end{pmatrix} \] (20)

The three eigen functions for boson system can be readily obtained from the eigen functions \( |a\rangle, |b\rangle \) and \( |c\rangle \) of fermionic system by replacing the bases \( |\uparrow\downarrow,0\rangle \rightarrow |2,0\rangle, |0,\uparrow\downarrow \rightarrow |0,2\rangle \) and \( (|\uparrow,\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow,\downarrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \rightarrow |1,1\rangle \). The corresponding eigenvalues \( E_a, E_b \) and \( E_c \) remain the same. As a result, many of the characteristics of bosonic system remain the same as that of the fermionic system, given the same input parameters.

Let the time-dependent wave function of the bosonic system be

\[ |\psi_B\rangle = C_0(t) |2,0\rangle + C_1(t) |1,1\rangle + C_2(t) |0,2\rangle \]

The coefficients for initial condition \( C_0(0) = 1, C_1(0) = 0 \) and \( C_2(0) = 0 \) are given by

\[ C_0(t) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-iU_+ t} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-iU_- t} \left\{ \cos \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) - \frac{iU_-}{\Omega} \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \right\} \] (21)

\[ C_1(t) = \frac{2\sqrt{2} J_i}{\Omega} e^{-iU_- t} \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \] (22)

\[ C_2(t) = -\frac{1}{2} e^{-iU_+ t} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-iU_- t} \left\{ \cos \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) - \frac{iU_-}{\Omega} \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \right\} \] (23)

For another initial condition \( C_0(0) = 0, C_1(0) = 1, C_2(0) = 0 \), we have

\[ C_0(t) = C_2(t) = \frac{2\sqrt{2} J_i}{\Omega} e^{-iU_- t} \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \] (24)

\[ C_1(t) = e^{-iU_- t} \left[ \cos \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) + \frac{iU_-}{\Omega} \sin \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \right] \] (25)

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1 shows that, near a broad Feshbach resonance, the inter-site interaction \( U_i \) is 3 orders of magnitude smaller than the on-site interaction \( U \). However, for a narrow resonance as shown in Fig. 2 \( U_i \) is not negligible compared to \( U \). The parameters chosen for the model DW potential as mentioned in the caption of Fig. 1 are comparable with the experimental parameters of Ref. 13 and so are realistic. We notice that for the narrow resonance, \( U \) exceeds the gap between the two energy bands, implying that two-mode or tight-binding approximation breaks down near a narrow resonance. In contrast, though \( U \) is relatively large near a broad resonance, it is still one order of magnitude smaller than the gap. For numerical illustration, we consider that the magnetic field is tuned near broad Feshbach resonance to the extent where one can work well within a two-mode approximation. We next analyze the eigen structure of two-site Hubbard models.

#### 4.1. Eigen structure

In case of two fermions, for \( U_i = 0 \), the eigen energies reduce to those obtained in Ref. 13, where it is experimentally demonstrated in that, once the system is prepared in the lowest eigen state \( |a\rangle \), a two-site counterpart of Mott insulator state can be realized by increasing the repulsive on-site interaction, while a two-site analog of charge density wave (CDW) state can be achieved by increasing the attractive on-site interaction. For \( U >> J >> U \) one can find \( E_a \sim -4J^2/U, E_c \sim U + 4J^2/U \). Here \( 4J^2/U \) is the coupling of the second order tunneling matrix element in the limit \( U_i \rightarrow 0 \) and \( U \rightarrow \infty \). So, the two lowest eigenstates \( |a\rangle \) and \( |d\rangle \) can be coupled by second order tunneling process. Similarly, the transition between the excited states \( |b\rangle \) and \( |c\rangle \) is possible via second order process. From Eqs. (11) and (10), it follows that, for \( U_+ > 0 \) and \( U_- > 4J \), \( |a\rangle \rightarrow |t\rangle \), implying that when the on-site interaction is large positive the ground state of the system is the Mott-insulator where each site is occupied by a single particle. On the other hand, for \( U_- < 0 \) and \( U_- > 4J \), \( |a\rangle \rightarrow |+\rangle \) which is characterized by enhanced double occupancy, representing CDW phase. The CDW phase is dominated by second order pair tunneling that connects the state \( |\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle \) to \( |0,\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \) via \( |t\rangle \). For \( 0 < U_- > 4J \), the excited state \( |c\rangle \rightarrow |+\rangle \) and behaves like a CDW.
phase. An interesting question arises: What will happen if $4J < U_i > U$? In this limit, Eqs. (11) and (13) yield $|a⟩ → |+⟩$ and $|c⟩ → −|t⟩$, that is for strong positive inter-site interactions, the ground state ($|a⟩$) will be dominated by double occupancy and also probably CDW-like phase while the excited state ($|c⟩$) will be like a Mott-Insulator with single occupancy. This happens because putting two atoms in the same well costs relatively less energy than to place them in two different wells. Next question is in which physical situation such a case may arise. Obviously this will not arise with finite-range interactions. However, for purely long-range interactions (with negligible short-range part) such as magnetic or electric dipole-dipole interactions this situation may occur.

\[ P_{\text{pair}} = 1 - \frac{8J^2}{\Omega^2} \sin^2 \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \]

\[ P_{\text{single}} = \frac{8J^2}{\Omega^2} \sin^2 \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \]

4.2. Occupation and tunneling

We define single occupancy ($\rho_s$) as the probability of finding one particle in each site and double occupancy ($\rho_d$) as probability of finding both particles in same site irrespective of whether both particles occupy the left or right site. They turn out to be the same for bosonic and fermionic cases for the same initial conditions. For both particles initially in one site, we obtain

\[ P_{\text{pair}} \]

\[ P_{\text{single}} \]

\[ P_{\text{no tunneling}} \]

For studying numerically the dynamical evolution, we set the parameters of the model DW potential of Eq.(1) such that, under the harmonic approximation, the trap frequency $\omega_z = 2\pi \times 1000 \text{ Hz}$ and $J \approx 150 \text{ Hz}$. Setting $U_i = 0$, we first plot the eigen energies as a function of $U$ in Fig 3 and reproduce the results reported in [15]. The double occupation probability decreases and single occupation probability increases in the ground state $|a⟩$ as $U$ changes from negative to positive value keeping $U_i = 0$. This means if the system is prepared in the ground eigenstate, by virtue of going from strong attractive to strong repulsive interaction regime ($|U| >> 4J$), the system will undergo from charge-wave-density phase [27] to Mott-insulating phase [36].

FIG. 4: The pair tunneling as a function of time with initially both particles being in one site. The parameters are $J = 150\text{Hz}$, $U = 0$ (a), $U = 3J$ (b) and $U = 20J$ (c) and $U_i = 0$.

FIG. 5: The time-averaged probabilities of pair tunneling, single particle tunneling and no tunneling are plotted as a function of $U/J$ with initially both particles in right well.
atoms being in the same site, we have

\[ P_{\text{pair}} = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \left( \frac{3}{2} + \frac{U^2}{2\Omega^2} \right) - \left( 1 + \frac{U_-}{\Omega} \right) \cos \left( \frac{(\Omega - U_-) t}{2} \right) \right. \\
- \left( 1 - \frac{U_-}{\Omega} \right) \cos \left( \frac{(\Omega + U_-) t}{2} \right) \right\} \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{U^2}{\Omega^2} \right) \cos (\Omega t) \left\} \right. \\

\[ P_{\text{single}} = \frac{8J^2}{\Omega^2} \sin^2 \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \] (29)

Again, these tunneling probabilities are same for both bosonic and fermionic cases for the same input parameters.

When \( U_i \neq 0 \) and the system is prepared with both particles initially in left (or right) well, the time evolution of pair tunneling probability as shown in Fig.4 has more than one frequencies of oscillations as the analytical result of Eq.(28) reveals. For \( U \neq 0 \) and \( U_i \neq 0 \), \( P_{\text{pair}} \) has three frequencies \((\Omega - U_-)/2, (\Omega + U_-)/2\) and \( \Omega \). From Eqs. (28,29), we find that for \( U = 3J \) and \( U_i = 0 \) as in Fig.4b, the maximum time period is \( T_{\text{max}} = 4\pi/(\Omega - U_-) = 2\pi/J \) and for \( U = 0 = U_i \), \( T_{\text{max}} = \pi/J \) (Fig.4a). Now, when \( U \) is very large, only one frequency dominates. We take the time average of the tunneling probability over the period \( T_{\text{max}} \). We have plotted the time-averaged probabilities of single-particle and pair tunneling as a function of \( U \) in Fig.5 for the system initially prepared with two atoms in single site. This shows the fact that when the interaction is sufficiently large, the system has tendency to stay in the same state that it was initially prepared.

We next discuss the dynamical behavior of the number and phase variables of the two systems.

\[ \langle \hat{a}_l^\dagger \hat{a}_l \rangle^2 \] where the subscript \( j \) stands for either \( l \) (left) or \( r \) (right). In terms of bosonic number operator \( \hat{N}_j = \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j \), this can be expressed as

\[ Q_j^{(B)} = \langle \hat{N}_j \rangle^2 - \langle \hat{N}_j \rangle^2 - \langle \hat{N}_j \rangle, \] (30)
Nieto [33]. The vacuum states play an essential role in the non-unitary phase-difference operators of Carruthers and their fluctuations for electromagnetic fields. They showed that the results for unitary phase operators deviate largely from those for non-unitary operators when the average photon number in the field is small [33]. In case of matter-waves, quantum phase operators are yet to be experimentally explored. It is theoretically shown that, quantum phase operators are particularly important for matter-waves with low number of bosons or fermions, consistent with the similar result in case of photons as shown in [34]. Explicitly, the fermionic unitary cosine and sine phase-difference operators are defined as

\[ C_{lr}^F = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{\sigma'\sigma} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma\sigma'} + 1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{\sigma} \hat{a}^\dagger_{\sigma'} \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma'} + 1 \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
+ \left. \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma\sigma'} + 1 \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{\sigma'} \hat{a}^\dagger_{\sigma} \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma} + 1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} + \sum_{j} \left\{ \langle |10\rangle_j |01\rangle_k + |01\rangle_k |10\rangle_j \right\} \}

\[ S_{lr}^F = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{\sigma'\sigma} \frac{1}{2\hbar} \left\{ \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma\sigma'} + 1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{\sigma} \hat{a}^\dagger_{\sigma'} \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma'} + 1 \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
- \left. \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma\sigma'} + 1 \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{\sigma'} \hat{a}^\dagger_{\sigma} \langle \hat{N}_{\sigma} + 1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} + \sum_{j} \frac{1}{\hbar} \left\{ \langle |10\rangle_j |01\rangle_k - |01\rangle_k |10\rangle_j \right\} \}

Where \(|01\rangle_j\) represents \(j\)-th configuration of spin states where \(r\sigma'\) state is occupied but \(l\sigma\) is empty and \(|10\rangle_k\) represents \(k\)-th configuration of spin states with \(l\sigma\) state being occupied and \(r\sigma'\) empty. Here \(N_c\) is the total number of spin configurations in the two spatial modes in which at least one of the left or right spin state is empty. For example, let us consider spin-half fermions with \(\uparrow\) and \(\downarrow\) spin states. In this case, total number of pairs of states are (i) \((l \uparrow, r \uparrow)\), (ii) \((l \downarrow, r \downarrow)\), (iii) \((l \uparrow, r \downarrow)\), and (iv) \((l \downarrow, r \uparrow)\). Now, if there are only a pair of two-component fermions in a symmetric DW, the question is how many distinct ways (configurations) one can fill up these states with the two fermions such that left (or right) state of any pair of states remains empty. The paired state (i) and (ii) lead to the configurations \(|0 \uparrow \uparrow\rangle \equiv |0 \uparrow \downarrow\rangle \) (or \(|0 \downarrow \downarrow\rangle\) and \(|0 \uparrow \downarrow\rangle \equiv |0 \uparrow \downarrow\rangle \) (or \(|0 \downarrow \uparrow\rangle\)). Similarly, the other two pair states (iii) and (iv) will lead to the same two configurations. So, for this case, \(N_c = 2\).

To study quantum phase fluctuations, we make use of matter-wave unitary operators corresponding to cosine and sine of phase-difference between the two modes. In quantum optics, unitary phase-difference operators [30, 31] are obtained by synthesizing the Pegg-Burnett unitary phase formalism [32] with the method of the non-unitary phase-difference operators of Carruthers and Nieto [33]. The vacuum states play an essential role in ensuring the unitarity of phase operators. In early 90’s, Mandel and co-workers experimentally measured cosine and sine of “operational” unitary phase operators and their fluctuations for electromagnetic fields. They showed that the results for unitary phase operators deviate largely from those for non-unitary operators when the average photon number in the field is small [34].
written as
\[ \hat{C}_{lr}^B = \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\hat{N}_l + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_l \hat{a}_r^\dagger (\hat{N}_r + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \hat{a}_r^\dagger (\hat{N}_r + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{N}_l + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_l + \frac{1}{2i} [\hat{N}, 0] \right] \]
\[ \hat{S}_{lr}^B = \frac{1}{2i} \left[ (\hat{N}_l + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_l \hat{a}_r^\dagger (\hat{N}_r + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \hat{a}_r^\dagger (\hat{N}_r + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{N}_l + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_l + \frac{1}{2i} [\hat{N}, 0] \right] \]

One can construct number-phase uncertainty relations and find a standard quantum limit (SQL) to show the dynamics of phase and number squeezing.

In the ground state |a\rangle, the expectation values of fermionic cosine and sine phase difference operators are \( \langle \hat{C}_{lr}^B \rangle = 8J^2/[16J^2 + (U_+ + \Omega)^2] \) and \( \langle \hat{S}_{lr}^B \rangle = 0 \), respectively. For bosonic system however, \( \langle \hat{C}_{lr}^B \rangle = 4\sqrt{2}J(\sqrt{2} + U_+ + \Omega)/[16J^2 + (U_+ + \Omega)^2] \) and \( \langle \hat{S}_{lr}^B \rangle = 0 \). The phase fluctuations are \( \Delta E_{\phi} = 2\sqrt{2}/\sqrt{8J^2 + (U_+ + \Omega)\sqrt{16J^2 + (U_+ + \Omega)^2}} \) and \( \Delta E_{\phi}^B = \sqrt{1 - [32J^2(U_+ + \Omega + \sqrt{2}J)^2]/[16J^2 + (U_+ + \Omega)^2]^2} \). Average number differences are always zero in the ground state but number fluctuations are nonzero, \( \Delta N^F = 8J/\sqrt{16J^2 + (U_+ + \Omega)^2} = \Delta N^B \). From these expression one can infer that for \( U_+ \to \infty \), fluctuations in the ground state are \( \Delta N^F \to 0 \), \( \Delta N^B \to 0 \), \( \Delta E_{\phi}^F \to 0 \), \( \Delta E_{\phi}^B \to 0 \). However, for \( U_+ \to -\infty \), \( \Delta N^F \to 1/2 \), \( \Delta N^B \to 1 \), \( \Delta E_{\phi}^F \to 3/4 \), \( \Delta E_{\phi}^B \to 1/2 \). On the other hand, in the non-interacting limit \( U_+ \to 0 \), we have \( \Delta N^B = 1/(2\sqrt{2}) \), \( \Delta N^F \to 1/(2\sqrt{2}) \), \( \Delta E_{\phi}^F \to \sqrt{3}/4 \), \( \Delta E_{\phi}^B \to \sqrt{1 - (4 + \sqrt{2})/32} \).

In the dynamical picture for two atoms initially being prepared in left or right well, the average of the cosine and sine phase-difference operators are
\[ \langle \hat{C}_{lr}^F \rangle = -\frac{4J^2}{\Omega^2} \sin^2 \left( \frac{\Omega t}{2} \right) \]
Whereas the number difference is
\[
\langle N^F \rangle = \langle N^B \rangle = 2 \left[ \frac{1 + U}{\Omega} \cos \left( \frac{(\Omega - U)t}{2} \right) \right.
\]
\[
+ \left. \left( 1 - \frac{U}{\Omega} \right) \cos \left( \frac{(\Omega + U)t}{2} \right) \right]
\] (43)

All the time averaged quantities are qualitatively similar for bosonic and fermionic systems for the same input parameters. We find that the inter-site number fluctuations for both fermionic and bosonic cases are identical. However, on-site or single-mode number fluctuation in fermionic case is different from that for bosonic case. In Fig.6 we have plotted the dynamics of $Q_j$ parameter for bosonic and fermionic system for different initial conditions. We show that, when both the atoms are initially prepared in the same well, $Q_j^{(F)}$ is always positive for $U \neq 0$ and zero for non-interacting fermions ($U = 0$), whereas, $Q_j^{(B)}$ is oscillating and mostly negative. For the other initial condition i.e., initially two atoms are in different well, the temporal behavior of $Q$-parameters are not drastically different for Bose and Fermi system apart from the magnitude of oscillations. We have plotted the time dependence of average phase difference, defined as $\sin^{-1}(\langle S_{lr} \rangle)$, in Fig.7. The dynamics of phase fluctuations are shown in Fig.8 for different initial conditions. We notice that for non-interacting atoms, time evolution of the phase fluctuation is a purely oscillatory function with single frequency of oscillation for both boson and fermion systems. When interaction is switched on, although the fermionic phase fluctuation exhibits sinusoidal oscillations with time, the dynamics of bosonic phase fluctuation becomes modulated. These modulations occur due to the small difference in the oscillation frequencies as can be obtained from Eqs. (17-19, 23, 25). For initially each of the two particles being in individual sites, the bosonic phase fluctuation remains close to 1, whereas, for fermion system it oscillates between 0 and 0.25. This shows the characteristic difference between bosonic and fermionic phase operators.

Before we end our discussions and analysis, we wish to address a related question: How do the purely long-range interactions which vary as inverse power law of the interatomic separation, such as magnetic dipole-dipole interaction of dipolar atoms can affect the results of Hubbard models? We have calculated $U$ and $U_t$ for two Cr atoms when the dipole moments are oriented parallel to each other. For dipolar on-site interaction turns out to be about 1.3 kHz and inter-site interaction is about 16.8 Hz. These results indicate that it is possible to include the long-range DDI of dipolar systems within the framework of extended Hubbard models with both on-site and inter-site interactions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have shown that bosonic and fermionic two-site Hubbard models with a pair of interacting cold atoms yield qualitatively same results for all the quantum statistical average quantities such as occupation statistics, single-particle and pair tunneling probabilities for the same input parameters. However, on-site number and inter-site quantum phase fluctuations are quite different for the two cases. We have found that time-dependent two-mode quantum phase fluctuation in fermionic case is always smaller than that in bosonic case for any interaction strength as illustrated in Fig.5. This contrasting behavior of quantum phase fluctuations may be important for exploring and understanding higher order coherences of ultracold bosonic and fermionic matter-waves [33, 34]. We have further demonstrated that resonant interactions with appreciable finite range can be accommodated into the models. However, for interactions with extremely large effective range such as that near narrow Feshbach resonances, the usual two-mode approximation of Hubbard models breaks down. As model interaction potentials that can account for finite range and resonances, we have considered Jost–Kohn potentials. These potentials are valid within the effective range approximations, since the energy of the lowest band of a typical DW potential is much smaller than 1 $\mu$K, the effective range approximation absolutely holds good in this regime as can be verified from the Ref. [21]. Our calculations show that for appreciable finite range of interactions, one can not neglect the effects of inter-site interaction as it can significantly influence the results [10]. This study may prove to be precursor for exploring two-site Hubbard models with resonant interactions. If one considers only a pair of atoms in a DW, then there is obviously no three-body interaction. If there are more than two atoms, then there is possibility of molecule formation by resonant three-body interaction which may lead to loss. However, if the DW trap is so designed such that it can also trap the molecule, then there would be possibility of intriguing coherent atom-molecule quantum dynamics in a DW. Multiple DW potentials connected in series will result in double-well optical lattice [11] which has been already employed for studying a variety of con-
trollable many-body effects including quantum gates. Inclusion of resonant interaction within the two-site or multi-site Hubbard models will open up a new perspective in these fields.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

One of us (SM) is thankful to the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Govt. of India, for a support. Two of us (KA and BD) are thankfully acknowledge the support form the Department of Science & Technology, Govt. of India, under the the project No. SB/S2/LOP-008/2014. We gratefully acknowledge many helpful discussions with Professor Krishna Rai Dastidar and Professor Deb Shankar Ray.