Inter-component asymmetry and formation of quantum droplets in quasi-one-dimensional binary Bose gases
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A quantum droplet is an ultradilute liquid state which emerges from the competitive interplay of two Hamiltonian terms, the mean-field (MF) energy and beyond-MF correction in a weakly interacting binary Bose gas. We analyze generation and stability of the droplets in the quasi-one-dimensional model, in both symmetric and asymmetric settings with respect to the two components. Asymmetry is represented by unequal densities or unequal intracomponent interaction strengths. We find that the latter factor gives rise to an asymmetric droplet, characterized by the population imbalance between the components. Further, we address the formation of asymmetric droplets in both the symmetric and asymmetric systems through the modulational instability induced by the beyond-MF term. The solutions confirm the stability of known symmetric solutions against symmetry-breaking perturbations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The mean-field (MF) theory of weakly interacting dilute atomic gases rules out the formation of a liquid state [1, 2]. However, it has been recently shown that a liquid phase arises if beyond-MF effects originating from quantum fluctuations around binary (two-component) MF states are taken into regard [3, 4]. A fundamental property which allows one to interpret this phase as a fluid is incompressibility: it attains a limit density which cannot be made larger (see details below), hence adding more atoms leads to expansion of the state. Another fundamental feature of this quantum-fluid phase is that it facilitates self-trapping of quantum droplets (QDs), which are stabilized by the interplay between the contact MF interaction and the beyond-MF Lee-Huang-Yang (LHY) correction [5]. Binary condensates with competing intra- and inter-component MF interactions offer a remarkable possibility for the generation of QDs, as proposed by Petrov [3], that was further elaborated in various settings, including different effective dimensions [6–18, 20]. In particular, the dynamics of QDs with the flat-top (FT) or Gaussian shape, which correspond, respectively, to large and small numbers of particles, was addressed in the framework of the one-dimensional (1D) reduction of the same model [20]. The theoretical prediction was followed by the experimental creation of QDs with quasi-2D [21, 22] and fully 3D [23, 25] shapes (see also a recent review [27]). Another theoretically predicted and experimentally realized option for the creation of QDs makes use of the single-component condensate with dipole-dipole interactions [2, 28, 35].

Collective modes of QDs are of special interest, as they reveal their internal dynamics [20, 26, 31, 14, 35]. In particular, the stable existence of the QDs is maintained if the particle-emission threshold lies below any possible excitation mode, hence a perturbation in the form of such a mode will not cause decay of the droplet.

We here aim to address two issues which are related to the creation of QDs in the effectively 1D setting. First, we consider the modulation instability (MI) of spatially uniform plane-wave (PW) states in the framework of the Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) equations with the LHY corrections [6] (another example of the MI in a binary BEC is provided by the system with the spin-orbit coupling [35]). The linear-stability analysis, followed by direct simulations of the corresponding GP equations, shows that the lower branch of the PW states exhibits MI, and the instability leads to splitting into a chain of localized droplet-like structures. Secondly, we address properties of the QDs in the binary condensate in the framework of the two-component GP system, without assuming inter-component symmetry. The asymmetry implies different intra-component MF self-repulsion coefficients in the GP system, and/or unequal norms of the two components. Asymmetric two-component states in the GP systems with the LHY corrections were considered in Refs. [7, 14, 18] and [12] for the 2D and 3D cases, respectively, but detailed analysis has not been performed in the 1D setting. We find that the population difference between the components does not significantly affect density profiles of QDs in the system with equal MF self-repulsion strengths in the two components. On the other hand, the profiles are essentially asymmetric when the self-repulsion coefficients are different. The findings corroborate stability of the known symmetric states against symmetry-breaking perturbations. We also address the MI of the two-component system, and demonstrate that chains of asymmetric QDs can be generated by the MI-induced nonlinear evolution.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce the model and discuss conditions necessary for the formation of the droplets. Section III deals with the single-component version of the symmetric system. We consider various solutions admitted by it (PW, FT, periodic, etc.), and apply the linear-stability analysis of the PW solution to assess the MI, in a combination with direct simulations. In Sec. IV we address the stability of asymmetric droplets, as well as formation of droplets in the two-component asymmetric system via the MI. The paper is concluded by Sec. V. Additional symmetric...
and asymmetric analytical solutions are presented in Appendices.

II. MODEL EQUATIONS

We consider the 1D model of the two-component BEC with coefficients of the intra-component repulsion, \(g_1 > 0\) and \(g_2 > 0\), and inter-component attraction, \(g_{12} < 0\). In the weak-interaction limit, the corresponding energy density, which includes the MF terms and LHY correction, was derived in Ref. [6]:

\[
\delta \rho_{1D} = \frac{(\sqrt{g_1} \rho_1 - \sqrt{g_2} \rho_2)^2}{2} + g \delta g \left( \frac{\sqrt{g_1} \rho_1 + \sqrt{g_2} \rho_2}{(g_1 + g_2)^2} \right)^2 - 2 \sqrt{m} (g_1 \rho_1 + g_2 \rho_2)^{3/2} \frac{1}{3\pi \hbar},
\]

(1)

where \(m\) is the atomic mass, \(\rho_j = |\Psi_j|^2\) \((j = 1, 2)\) is the density of the \(j\)-th component, represented by the MF wave function \(\Psi_j\), and

\[
g \equiv g_1 g_2, \quad \delta g \equiv g_{12} + g.
\]

(2)

The last term in Eq. (1) represents the LHY correction. Derivation of Eq. (1) assumes that the binary BEC is close to the point of the MF repulsion-attraction balance, with \(|\delta g| \ll g\). In experiments, \(\delta g\) may be tuned to be both positive and negative [21-23].

Equation (1) is valid in the case of tight confinement applied in the transverse dimensions, which makes the setting effectively one-dimensional. In the 3D case, the LHY term \(\sim -\rho^{3/2}\) (for \(\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho\)) is replaced by one \(\sim +\rho^{5/2}\). A detailed consideration of the crossover from 3D to 1D [13, 24-25] in the two-component system is a problem which may be a subject of a separate work. Here, it is relevant to compare the symmetric version of expression (1) for the energy density with that recently presented in Ref. [13]. It demonstrates that an accurately derived LHY contribution to the energy density of the 1D system contains, in addition to the \(\rho^{3/2}\) term, which was derived in Ref. [6], a term \(\sim \rho^2\), which can be absorbed into the mean-field energy density, and a higher-order term \(\sim \rho^3\), which was omitted in the analysis reported in Ref. [13]. A formula concluded in that work is that the energy density originally derived in Ref. [6] is literally valid if the ratio of the mean-field energy to that of the transverse confinement takes values \(\lesssim 0.03\). For typical experimental parameters, this implies that the difference between absolute values of scattering lengths of the mean-field intra-component repulsion and inter-component attraction should be \(\lesssim 1\) nm, which may be achieved in the experiment. The 1D QDs originate from the balance of the second term in Eq. (1), corresponding to the weak repulsive MF interaction, with \(\delta g > 0\), and the LHY term, which introduces effective attraction in the 1D setting, on the contrary to the repulsion in the 3D setting [6, 20].

The energy functional, \(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta \rho_{1D} dZ\), gives rise to the system of GP equations, which include the LHY correction,

\[
\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_1}{\partial Z^2} + (g_1 + Gg_2) |\Psi_1|^2 \Psi_1 - (1 - G) g |\Psi_2|^2 \Psi_1 - \frac{g_1 \sqrt{m}}{\pi \hbar} \sqrt{8 |\Psi_1|^2 + g_2 |\Psi_2|^2} \Psi_1,
\]

\[
\int_{\infty} |\Psi_j|^2 dZ = N_j.
\]

(3)

where \(T\) and \(Z\) are the time and coordinate measured in physical units. The normalization of the components of the wave function is determined by numbers of bosons in each component:

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\Psi_j|^2 dZ = N_j.
\]

(4)

We define parameter

\[
G = \frac{2 g \delta g}{(g_1 + g_2)^2},
\]

(5)

which measures the deviation from the MF repulsion-attraction balance point. Further, rescaling

\[
\left( \frac{mg^2}{\hbar^2} \right) T = \tau, \quad \left( \frac{mg^2}{\hbar^2} \right) Z = z, \quad \left( \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{mg}} \right) \Psi_{1,2} \equiv \psi_{1,2}
\]

(6)

casts Eq. (3) in the normalized form,

\[
i \frac{\partial \psi_1}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \psi_1}{\partial z^2} + (P + GP^{-1}) |\psi_1|^2 \psi_1 - (1 - G) |\psi_2|^2 \psi_1 - \frac{P}{\pi} \sqrt{|\psi_1|^2 + P^{-1} |\psi_2|^2} \psi_1,
\]

\[
i \frac{\partial \psi_2}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \psi_2}{\partial z^2} + (P^{-1} + GP) |\psi_2|^2 \psi_2 - (1 - G) |\psi_1|^2 \psi_2 - \frac{1}{\pi P} \sqrt{P^{-1} |\psi_1|^2 + P |\psi_2|^2} \psi_2,
\]

(7)

where parameter

\[
P \equiv \sqrt{\frac{g_1}{g_2}} = \frac{g_1}{g}
\]

(8)

determines the asymmetry of the system, in the case of \(P \neq 1\). Note that, for stationary solutions with chemical potentials \(\mu_{1,2}\), sought for as

\[
\psi_{1,2}(z, t) = \exp(-i \mu_{1,2} t) \phi_{1,2}(z),
\]

(9)

states with mutually proportional components,

\[
\phi_1(z) = K \phi_2(z),
\]

(10)

are only possible in the fully symmetric case, with \(P = 1\), \(\mu_1 = \mu_2\), and \(K = 1\).
III. THE SINGLE-COMPONENT GP MODEL

By imposing the symmetry constraint, \( g_1 = g_2 \equiv g \) [\( P = 1 \), see Eq. (9)] and \( \psi_i = \psi_2 = \psi \), Eq. (1) simplifies to

\[
\epsilon_{1D} = \frac{\hbar^4}{m^2 g^2} \delta \rho_{1D} = \frac{\delta g}{g} n^2 - \frac{25/2}{3\pi} n^{3/2},
\]

with the single dimensionless density, \( n = |\psi|^2 \equiv (\hbar^2/mg) \rho \) [see Eq. (6)]. Assuming a spatially uniform state, we calculate the equilibrium density from Eq. (11) as

\[
n_0 = \frac{8}{9\pi^2} \left( \frac{g}{\delta g} \right)^2,
\]
which corresponds to the minimum of the energy per particle, \( \partial_n[\epsilon_{1D}(n)] = 0 \), as shown in Ref. [6]. The corresponding chemical potential is given by condition \( \partial_n[\epsilon_{1D} - 2\mu n] = 0 \), i.e.,

\[
\mu_0 = -\frac{4}{9\pi^2} \frac{g}{\delta g},
\]

which is negative for \( \delta g/g > 0 \).

The single-component reduction of Eqs. (7) is tantamount to the equation introduced in Ref. [6].

\[
\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\delta g}{g} |\psi|^2 \psi - \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{\pi} |\psi| \psi,
\]

with normalization condition

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\psi(z)|^2 dz = N,
\]

where \( N \) is the scaled number of atoms in each component.

Although coefficient \( \delta g/g \) can be scaled out in Eq. (14), as done in Ref. [20], we keep it as a free parameter. This option is convenient for the subsequent consideration of the MI, treating \( \delta g/g \) and density \( n \) as independent constants, which may be matched to experimentally relevant parameters.

Below, we address two stationary solutions of Eq. (14). One is the FT state, i.e., an extended self-bound mode with a finite size, whose properties were considered in detail in Refs. [6] and [20], and are recapitulated below for the completeness of the presentation. The other solution is the PW solution with a uniform density. In subsection III.C we address its MI and ensuing spontaneous generation of chains of localized modes. Some additional families of symmetric and asymmetric analytical solutions to Eq. (14) are presented in Appendix [A].

A. The flat-top (FT) solution

As shown in Refs. [6] [20] [37], at \( \delta g/g > 0 \) Eq. (14) gives rise to an exact localized FT solution representing a QD which originates from the balance between the effective cubic self-repulsion and quadratic attraction:

\[
\psi(z,t) = \frac{Ae^{-\mu t}}{1 + Bcosh(\sqrt{2}\mu z)}
\]

Figure 1. The maximum density \( n_{max} \equiv n(z=0) \) in the FT (flat-top) state, as per Eq. (19), and the PW (plane-wave) density are displayed as functions of \( \mu \) by the red solid and blue dashed curves, respectively, for \( \delta g/g = 0.05 \). In this case, Eqs. (12) and (13) yield \( n_0 = 36.025 \) and \( \mu_0 = -0.90633 \). The PW solution includes upper and lower branches corresponding to \( n^2 \), as given by Eq. (26), the lower one (marked by circles) being subject to the MI (modulational instability). Coordinates of the spinodal point, \( (\mu_-,n_0) \), are given by Eqs. (27) and (28). For other values of \( \delta g/g \), the plot can be generated from the present one by rescaling. The inset shows the density profile of the FT solution for \( \delta g/g = 0.05 \) and \( \mu = \mu_0 + 0.00001 \), very close to the delocalization (PW) limit.
The total scaled number of atoms (norm) \( N(\mu) \) of the exact QD solutions given by Eqs. (16) and (17) is
\[
N(\mu) = n_0 \sqrt{-\frac{2}{\mu_0}} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - \mu/\mu_0}}{\sqrt{1 - \mu/\mu_0}} \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\mu_0}} \right].
\] (20)
It satisfies the well-known Vakhitov-Kolokolov (VK) necessary stability criterion [39],
\[
\frac{dN(\mu)}{d\mu} = -\frac{n_0}{\mu_0^2} \sqrt{-\frac{\mu}{2}} 1 - \frac{1}{\mu/\mu_0} < 0,
\] (21)
due to \( \mu_0 < 0 \) and \( 0 < \mu/\mu_0 < 1 \). Full stability of the QD family has been verified by direct simulations of the evolution of perturbed QDs in the framework of Eq. (14) [20].

It is relevant to mention that the exact soliton solution is valid too in the case of \( \delta g < 0 \), when the cubic term in Eq. (11) is self-attractive, similar to the quadratic one. In that case, \( \mu_0 \) is positive, pursuant to Eq. (13), while the chemical potential of the soliton remains negative, \( \mu < 0 \). Then, it follows from Eqs. (16) and (17) that the soliton exists for all values of \( \mu < 0 \), and it does not feature the FT shape. Rather, with the increase of \( -\mu \), it demonstrates a crossover between the “KdV-like” shape \( \sim \text{sech}^2 \left( \sqrt{-\mu/2} z \right) \) and the classical nonlinear-Schrödinger one, \( \sim \text{sech} \left( \sqrt{-2\mu} z \right) \). For \( \delta g < 0 \), the \( N(\mu) \) dependence for the soliton family carries over into the following form, which is an analytical continuation of expression (20),
\[
N(\mu)|_{\delta g < 0} = n_0 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\mu_0}} \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\mu_0}} - \arctan \left( \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\mu_0}} \right) \right],
\] (22)
This dependence also satisfies the VK criterion.

B. The plane-wave (PW) solution

The PW solution of Eq. (14),
\[
\psi(z,t) = \sqrt{n} \exp(iK_{PW} z - i\mu t)
\] (23)
with wavenumber \( K_{PW} \) and constant density \( n \), which determine the corresponding chemical potential:
\[
\mu_{PW} = \frac{\delta g}{g} n - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \sqrt{n + \frac{1}{2}K_{PW}^2}.
\] (24)
The Galilean invariance of Eq. (14) implies that any quiescent solution \( \psi_0(z,t) \), including the PW given by Eqs. (23) and (24), generates a family of moving solutions, with arbitrary velocity \( c \):
\[
\psi_c(z,t) = \exp \left( icz - \frac{i}{2} c^2 t \right) \psi_0(z - ct, t),
\] (25)
hence \( K_{PW} \) in solution (23) can be canceled by means of transformation (25) with \( c = -K_{PW} \).

For given \( \mu \), Eq. (24) produces two different branches of the density as a function of \( \mu \) (here, \( K_{PW} = 0 \) is set):
\[
\sqrt{n^+(\mu)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{g}{\delta g} \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left( \frac{g}{\delta g} \right)^2 + \frac{g}{\delta g} \mu.
\] (26)
For \( \delta g/g = 0.05 \), these branches are shown in Fig. 1. As follows from Eq. (26), they exist (for \( \delta g > 0 \)) above a minimum value of \( \mu \):
\[
\mu \geq \mu_c = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{g}{\delta g} = \frac{9}{8} \mu_0,
\] (27)
the corresponding density being
\[
n_c = \frac{1}{16} \left( \frac{g}{\delta g} \right)^2 \equiv \frac{9}{16} n_0.
\] (28)
Values \( \mu = \mu_c \) and \( n = n_c \) correspond to the spinodal point [6], and \( n^+(\mu) = n_0 \). Note that the above-mentioned existence region of the soliton solution, given by Eq. (18) (for \( \delta g > 0 \)), lies completely inside of interval (27) of the existence of the PW state, i.e., in terms of the chemical potential, the soliton always coexists with the PW (this fact is also obvious in Fig. 1).

C. Modulational instability (MI) of the plane waves (PWs)

Figure 2. Color-coded values of the MI gain, as given by Eq. (33), are displayed for fixed \( n = 40 \) in (a), and for fixed \( \delta g/g = 0.05 \) in (b). Note that panel (a) covers both signs of the cubic nonlinearity, \( \delta g > 0 \) and \( \delta g < 0 \). The solid and dashed white curves represent the MI boundary [Eq. (34)] and the peak value of the MI gain [Eq. (35)], respectively.

Here, we aim to analyze the MI of PW solutions Eq. (23) and check how the development of the MI can help to generate QD states. We perform the analysis for the PWs with zero wavenumber, \( K_{PW} = 0 \). As mentioned above, this is sufficient, due to the Galilean invariance of the underlying equation.

A small perturbation is added to stationary state (23) as
\[
\psi(z,t) = \left[ \sqrt{n} + \delta \psi(z,t) \right] \exp(-i\mu t).
\] (29)
The substitution of this expression in Eq. (14) and linearization with respect to perturbation \( \delta \psi \) leads to the following
Bogoliubov-de Gennes equation,
\[
i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \delta \psi = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \delta \psi + \frac{\delta g}{g} n(\delta \psi + \delta \psi^*) - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} (\delta \psi + \delta \psi^*). \tag{30}
\]

Further, by looking for perturbation eigenmodes with wavenumber \(k\) and frequency \(\Omega\) in the form of
\[
\delta \psi = \zeta \cos(kz - \Omega t) + i\eta \sin(kz - \Omega t), \tag{31}
\]
where \(\zeta\) and \(\eta\) are real infinitesimal amplitudes, Eq. (30) yields a dispersion relation for eigenfrequencies:
\[
\Omega^2 = \frac{k^4}{4} + \left( \frac{\delta g}{g} n - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right) k^2. \tag{32}
\]

The MI is characterized by its gain,
\[
\sigma = |\text{Im}\Omega|, \tag{33}
\]
in the case when Eq. (32) produces complex eigenfrequencies, i.e., at \(n < n_c\), where \(n_c\) corresponds to the spinodal point as given by Eq. (28). The instability region in terms of \(k\) is given by
\[
k^2 < k_0^2 \equiv 4 \left( \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} - \frac{\delta g}{g} n \right). \tag{34}
\]

The MI gain, given by Eq. (33), is plotted in Fig. 2 versus \(|k|\) and \(\delta g/g\), for given density \(n = 40\), in panel (a), and versus \(|k|\) and \(n\), for given \(\delta g/g = 0.05\), in (b). It is easy to find from Eq. (32) that the largest gain is attained at a wavenumber
\[
k_{\text{max}} = k_0/\sqrt{2}, \tag{35}
\]
with \(k_0\) defined as per Eq. (34). Note that Fig. 2(a) includes the case of the self-attractive cubic nonlinearity, with \(\delta g < 0\), which, naturally, displays much stronger MI, as in that case it is driven by both nonlinear terms, the quadratic and cubic ones.

Comparing parameter values at which QD solutions of the FT type are predicted to appear, and the MI condition for the PW with the corresponding density, the MI is expected to provide a mechanism for the creation of the QDs. This is confirmed by direct simulations in Fig. 3, where the PW with \(n = 10\) is taken as the input. For \(\delta g/g = 0.05\), it is subject to the MI, as seen in Fig. 2(b). The simulations of Eq. (14) were run with periodic boundary conditions. As seen in Fig. 3, small initial perturbations trigger the emergence of multiple-QD patterns (chains) at \(t \geq 100\). For these parameters, Eqs. (32)-(35) predict \(k_{\text{max}} = 0.6508\) and \(\sigma(k_{\text{max}}) = 0.2118\), which determines the wavelength of the fastest growing modulation, \(\lambda = 2\pi/k_{\text{max}} \approx 9.66\), and the growth-time scale, \(\tau = 2\pi/\sigma(k_{\text{max}}) \approx 30\). The number of the generated droplets in Fig. 3 is consistent with estimate \(L/\lambda \approx 10\), where \(L = 100\) is the size of the simulation domain. Note that the number of the droplets varies (actually, becomes smaller) due to inelastic collisions between them, which agrees with the dynamical properties of 1D QDs reported in Ref. [20].

To implement this mechanism of the generation of a chain of solitons in the experiment, i.e., make the density smaller than the critical value given by Eq. (28), one may either apply interaction quench (by means of the Feshbach resonance), suddenly decreasing \(\delta g/g\), as was done, for different purposes, in recent experimental works [21, 23, 38]. Another option, which is specific to the 1D setting, is sudden decrease of density \(n\), by relaxing the transverse trapping.

Figure 3. A typical example of the MI development, starting from an unstable PW state, with density \(n = 10\) and \(\delta g/g = 0.05\), which is subject to the MI, pursuant to Fig. 2. In (a), the spatiotemporal pattern of the evolution of the condensate density is shown. In the right panels, cross sections of the density profiles are displayed at \(t = 100\) (b), \(t = 120\) (c), and \(t = 140\) (c). The simulations were performed in domain \(-50 < z < +50\) with 2500 grid points and periodic boundary conditions.

IV. THE TWO-COMPONENT GROSS-PITAEVSKII (GP) SYSTEM

In this section, we revert to the full two-component GP system (7), aiming to explore formation of QD states in it. The two-component setting may include asymmetry in parameters (which may be present in the experimental setup as well), or may be imposed in the symmetric system by a difference in populations of the two components. The latter option suggests a possibility to check the stability of the results produced by reducing the symmetric system to the effective single-component form against symmetry-breaking perturba-
tions. First, we will address droplets in the two-component model with different populations, \(N_1/N_2 \neq 1\), as well as with different intra-component interaction strengths, i.e., \(P \neq 1\), see Eq. (5). Then, MI of PW states in the two-component system will be considered.

Because, as said above, solutions with mutually proportional components [see Eq. (10)] are possible solely in the strictly symmetric setting, asymmetric QDs cannot be found in an exact analytical form. As shown in Appendix B [see Eqs. (B1)-(B7)], asymptotic analytical solutions can be obtained for strongly asymmetric states, with one equation replaced by its linearized version. In this section, we chiefly rely on a numerical solution of Eq. (7).

### A. Asymmetric QDs with unequal populations \((N_1 \neq N_2)\) in the symmetric system \((P = 1)\)

In the symmetric system with \(P = 1\) [see Eq. (8)], droplet states were produced as stationary solutions of Eq. (7) by means of the imaginary-time-evolution method with the Neumann’s boundary conditions, under the constraint that the norm is fixed in the first component, \(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz |\psi_1(z)|^2 = N_1\), while chemical potential \(\mu_2\) is fixed in the second component, allowing its norm \(N_2\) to vary.

![Figure 4](image-url)

Figure 4. (a) Stationary weakly asymmetric (with respect to the two components) solutions of Eq. (7), obtained for \(\mu_2 = -0.4, -0.04, 0\) with fixed \(N_1 = 100\). Dashed and solid curves display density profiles of the first \((n_1)\) and second \((n_2)\) components, respectively. (b) The semi-log plot of the density profiles of \(n_2\) in (a) at \(z > 0\). Dependencies of \(N_2\) (black dots: the left vertical axis) and asymmetry parameter \(\delta_{21}\), defined as per Eq. (36) (the red dashed line pertaining to the right vertical axis), on \(\mu_2\) for fixed \(N_1 = 100\). The parameters are \(P = 1\) \((g_1 = g_2)\) and \(\delta g/g = 0.05\). The symmetric point with \(N_1 = N_2 = 100\) and \(\delta_{21} = 0\) corresponds to \(\mu_1 = \mu_2 = -0.88878\).

Figure 4 displays essential features of weakly asymmetric droplets for \(\delta g/g = 0.05\) and fixed \(N_1 = 100\). The symmetric (completely overlapping) solution, with \(N_1 = N_2\), is found at \(\mu_1 = \mu_2 = -0.88878\). When \(\mu_2\) deviates from this value, profiles of the two components become slightly different. In Fig. 4(a), the components still seem practically identical, but panel 4(b) demonstrates that \(\psi_2\) develops small-amplitude extended tails, which are absent in \(\psi_1\). Due to the contribution of the tails, the approach of \(\mu_2 < 0\) towards zero leads to the increase of norm \(N_2\), as seen in Fig. 4(c). Note that the growth of \(N_2(\mu_2)\) at \(\mu_2 \rightarrow -0\) is opposite to the decay of the QD’s norm in the single-component model at \(\mu \rightarrow -0\), cf. Eq. (20). At \(\mu_2 \geq 0\), the \(\psi_2\) component undergoes delocalization, with its tails developing a nonzero background at \(|z| \rightarrow \infty\), as seen in the density profile displayed in Fig. 4(b) for \(\mu_2 = 0\), and norm \(N_2(\mu)\) diverging at \(\mu \rightarrow -0\) in Fig. 4(c).

In Fig. 4(c), we also plot the parameter of the asymmetry between the two components, defined as

\[
\delta_{21} = \frac{n_2(z = 0) - n_1(z = 0)}{n_2(z = 0) + n_1(z = 0)}. \tag{36}
\]

It increases almost linearly with \(\mu_2\), although its absolute value does not exceed 0.02. Thus, the droplet tends to keep a nearly symmetric profile, with respect to the two components, in the symmetric system even if the population imbalance is admitted. In fact, this circumstance makes the analysis self-consistent, as the use of the GP system with the LHY correction implies that the MF intra- and inter-component interactions nearly cancel each other, which is possible only if shapes of the two components are nearly identical.

### B. Quantum droplets in the asymmetric system with \(P \neq 1\)

\((g_1 \neq g_2)\)

In the asymmetric system, we set \(P > 1\), without loss of generality. Then, the MF energy is minimized for \(n_2 > n_1\). The situation with \(n_1 > n_2\) can be considered replacing \(P\) by \(P^{-1}\).

Following the procedure similar to that employed in Sec. A, we produce QD solutions for \(\delta g/g = 0.05\), \(N_1 = 100\), and several different values of \(P\), varying \(\mu_2\). In Fig. 5(a), we plot density profiles for three different values of \(P\). Naturally, the difference of the two components increases with the increase of \(P\). In Fig. 5(b) we display \(N_2\) and parameter \(\delta_{21}\) [see Eq. (36)] of the asymmetric QDs for \(P = 1.25\) and 1.67. All these states have been checked to be stable in time-dependent simulations.

The density difference at the center of the droplet can be determined by the condition of the existence of the liquid phase in the free space. This condition is obtained by minimizing the grand-potential density \(\delta_{1D} - \mu_1 \rho_1 - \mu_2 \rho_2\) \([6, 15]\), which leads to the zero-pressure condition,

\[
p(\rho_1, \rho_2) = -\delta_{1D} + \sum_{j=1,2} \left( \frac{\partial \delta_{1D}}{\partial \rho_j} \right) \rho_j \\
\approx -\delta_{1D} + \mu_1 \rho_1 + \mu_2 \rho_2 = 0. \tag{37}
\]
the dominant first term in Eq. (38). It is seen that a larger maximum value of \( P_n \) corresponds to the density in the FT region. The ascending value of the particle-number asymmetry, \( \rho \), instead of the density. Here, we aim to find a largest characterise the asymmetry by using the total particle number the figure displays a log-log plot).

As the QDs have a finite particle number, it is relevant to characterize the asymmetry by using the total particle number (norm) instead of the density. Here, we aim to find a largest value of the particle-number asymmetry,

\[
\Delta_{21} = \frac{(N_2 - N_1)}{N_T},
\]

where \( N_T = N_1 + N_2 \) is the total number of atoms, which admits the existence of the QDs. For given \( N_1 \), we obtain the upper bound for \( N_2 \) above which the solution becomes delocalized, and calculate the corresponding critical value of \( \Delta_{21} \). The results are shown in Fig. 7. For the symmetric system with \( P = 1 \), the curve demonstrates an empirical dependence \( \Delta_{21} \propto N_T^{-\alpha} \) with exponent \( \alpha \approx 0.58 \). It is likely that the asymmetry vanishes asymptotically for very “heavy” droplets, at \( N_T \to \infty \). As the system’s asymmetry slightly increases to \( P = 1.25 \), the exponent is significantly reduced for small \( N_T \), and converges to a certain finite value at \( N_T \to \infty \). Thus, it
is again confirmed that values \( P > 1 \) can maintain conspicuous asymmetry between the components. Finally, strongly asymmetric non-FT (Gaussian-shaped [20]) solutions can be obtained in an approximate analytical form for any value of \( P \), as shown in Appendix B.

C. The modulational instability (MI) of the asymmetric PW states

The MI of the two-component PW solutions is a relevant subject too. Such solutions are looked for as \( \psi_j(z,t) = \sqrt{\eta_j} e^{-i\mu_j t}, j = 1, 2. \) The substitution of this in Eq. (7) yields

\[
\mu_1 = (P + GP^{-1})n_1 + (-1 + G)n_2 - \frac{P}{\pi} \sqrt{Pn_1 + n_2^2}, \\
\mu_2 = (P^{-1} + GP)n_2 + (-1 + G)n_1 - \frac{1}{\pi P} \sqrt{Pn_1 + n_2^2}. \tag{41}
\]

Accordingly, in the symmetric system with \( P = 1 \), densities of the asymmetric PW state are expressed in terms of the chemical potentials as

\[
n_j = \frac{1}{4} \left[ \frac{1}{\pi^2 G^2} + \frac{\mu_1 + \mu_2}{G} + (-1)^{j+1} (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \right] + \frac{\sqrt{1 + 2\pi^2 G(\mu_1 + \mu_2)}}{4\pi^2 G^2}. \tag{42}
\]

We introduce the perturbation around the PW states as

\[
\delta \psi_j = \xi_j \cos(kz - \Omega t) + \eta_j \sin(kz - \Omega t), \tag{43}
\]

with infinitesimal amplitudes \( \xi_j \) and \( \eta_j \), cf. Eq. (31). The substitution of this in Eqs. (7) and the linearization with respect to \( \xi_j \) and \( \eta_j \) yields the dispersion equation for the perturbation:

\[
\Omega_j^2 = \frac{k^2}{4} \left[ k^2 + 2(P_1 + P_2 - Q_1 - Q_2) \right] + \frac{k^2}{2} \sqrt{(P_1 - P_2 - Q_1 + Q_2)^2 + 4(R - S)^2}, \tag{44}
\]

cf. Eq. (32), where

\[
P_1 = (P + GP^{-1})n_1, \quad P_2 = (P^{-1} + GP)n_2, \\
R = (-1 + G)\sqrt{n_1 n_2}, \quad S = \frac{\sqrt{n_1 n_2}}{2\pi \sqrt{Pn_1 + P^{-1}n_2}}, \tag{45}
\]

\[
Q_1 = \frac{P^2 n_1}{2\pi \sqrt{Pn_1 + P^{-1}n_2}}, \quad Q_2 = \frac{P^{-2} n_2}{2\pi \sqrt{Pn_1 + P^{-1}n_2}}.
\]

For \( P = 1 \) and \( n_1 = n_2 \), these results reproduce Eq. (32) for the \( \Delta \_ \) branch. A parameter region in which at least one squared eigenfrequency \( \Omega_j^2 \) is negative gives rise to the MI of the two-component state.

Figure 8. Numerically simulated development of the MI of asymmetric PW states in the symmetric two-component system, with \( P = 1 \) and \( \delta g \approx 0.05 \). The initial PW states are taken with fixed total density, \( (n_1 + n_2)/2 = 10 \). (a) The evolution of the central density of the first component, \( n_1(z=0) \), for different density ratios in the two components, \( n_{12} = n_1/n_2 \). (b,c) Snapshots of density profiles for the cases of (b) \( n_{12} = 1 \) at \( t = 200 \) and (c) \( n_{12} = 9 \) at \( t = 400 \). Panels (d,e) and (f,g) are top views of the spatiotemporal evolution of the densities, \( n_1(z,t) \) and \( n_2(z,t) \), for \( n_{12} = 1 \) and \( n_{12} = 9 \), respectively. Simulations were performed in domain \(-50 \leq z \leq +50 \) with 2048 grid points, subject to periodic boundary conditions.
In Fig. 8 we display typical examples of numerically simulated development of the MI in the symmetric two-component system with $P = 1$ [see Eq. (8)] and population imbalance. For the consistency with the single-component situation displayed in Fig. 3 we here fix the total density as $(n_1 + n_2)/2 = 10$. Figure 8(a) shows the evolution of central-point values of the density of the first component, $n_1(z = 0)$, for different values of the density ratio, $n_{12} = n_1/n_2$. Time required for the actual onset of the instability increases with the increase in $n_{12}$, as is clearly shown by the density-plot evolution in Figs. 8(d,e) for $n_{12} = 1$ and (f,g) for $n_{12} = 9$. This observation can be understood in terms of the MI gain given by Eq. (45), as additionally shown in Fig. 9.

Spatial profiles at fixed time, which are plotted in Fig. 8(b,c) for these two cases, show fragmentation of the profiles into sets of localized structures. The decrease in the number of fragments with the increase in $n_{12}$ is explained by the decrease in $k_{\text{max}}$, see Fig. 9. For $n_{12} = 1$, the results are the same as in the single-component case, as coinciding profiles in the two components of the symmetric system are stable against spontaneous symmetry breaking. On the other hand, when $n_{12} \neq 1$ an in-phase localized structure appears, keeping the initial density imbalance. Since one can select an arbitrary ratio of densities of the two components for the initial PW state, a highly asymmetric structure, like the one displayed in Fig. 8(c), can emerge even for $P = 1$, as a result of the MI-induced nonlinear evolution.

In Fig. 10 we present the development of the MI in the asymmetric two-component system with $P = 1.25$ for a fixed total density, $(n_1 + n_2)/2 = 10$. Figure 10(a) displays the evolution of the central-point density of the first component, $n_1(z = 0)$, for different values of the density ratio, $n_{12} = n_1/n_2$. It shows that time required for the development of the MI increases with the increase in the asymmetry of the density. This is also evident in the density plots of the temporal evolution of the first component shown in Figs. 10(e-g).

![Figure 9](image9.png)  
Figure 9. (a) Wavenumber $k_{\text{max}}$ and (b) MI gain $\sigma(k_{\text{max}})$ representing the largest growth rate produced by Eq. (45) for $P = 1$, $\delta g/g = 0.05$, and $(n_1 + n_2)/2 = 10$.

![Figure 10](image10.png)  
Figure 10. Numerically simulated development of the modulational instability in the asymmetric two-component system with $\delta g/g = 0.05$ and $P = 1.25$. The initial PW states are taken with a fixed total density, $(n_1 + n_2)/2 = 10$. (a) The evolution of the central density of the first component, $n_1(z = 0)$, for different density ratios in the two components, $n_{12} = n_1/n_2$. (b-d) Snapshots of density profiles for the cases of (b) $n_{12} = n_1/n_2 \sim 0.1$ at $t = 300$, (c) $n_{12} = 1$ at $t = 200$ and (d) $n_{12} = 9$ at $t = 600$. Panels (e-g) represent the top view of the spatiotemporal evolution of the densities, $n_1(z,t)$, corresponding to (b-d), respectively [the evolution of $n_2(z,t)$ shows similar patterns]. Simulations were performed in domain $-50 \leq z \leq +50$ with 2048 grid points, subject to periodic boundary conditions.
This result is consistent with Eq. (45), which shows a decrease in the MI gain with the increase in the asymmetry even for $P \neq 1$. Spatial profiles at fixed time, displayed in Fig. 10(b–d), show fragmentation of the profiles. Figure 10(c) clearly indicates that, even for $n_{12} = 1$, the MI generates asymmetric droplet-like structures similar to Fig. 5(a), where the complete overlapping of the two densities does not occur.

V. CONCLUSION

The subject of this work is to study the dynamics of PWs (plane waves) and QDs (quantum droplets) in the system described by the coupled GP (Gross-Pitaevskii) equations including the LHY (Lee-Huang-Yang) terms in the effectively 1D setting, which is a model of weakly interacting binary Bose gases with balanced interactions between the repulsive intra-component coupling strength and the attractive inter-component one. We have analyzed the MI (modulational instability) of the lower branch of PW states in both symmetric and asymmetric systems, and considered formation of a chain of soliton-like states with the FT (flat-top) shape, as a result of the development of MI. We have also explored the structure of QDs which are asymmetric with respect to the two components, both in the symmetric system with unequal population of the components, and in the asymmetric system. In fact, the asymmetric states admit only relatively small imbalance of the populations, which makes the considered setting self-consistent. Thus, the results corroborate that the previously known symmetric states are robust against symmetry-breaking disturbances.

These predictions can be tested experimentally by preparing uniform binary Bose gases with equal or different densities, and suddenly reducing the strength of the effective MF (mean-field) interaction by means of the Feshbach-resonance-provided quench, in order to enhance the relative strength of the LHY terms. The present analysis being restricted to the 1D setting, effects of the tight transverse confinement and crossover to the 3D configuration [13, 24, 25] deserves further consideration.
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Appendix A: Other exact solutions for the single-component GP equation

Here we briefly list other types of exact solutions of the single-component equation [14], in addition to the FT and PW solutions [16] and [29] which were considered in detail above (solutions to Eq. (14) in the form of dark and anti-dark solitons were reported in Ref. [37]). The stability of a majority of these solutions is not addressed here, as it should be a subject for a separate work.

1. $\delta g/g > 0$

In the case of comparable quadratic self-attraction and cubic repulsion in Eq. (14) with $\delta g > 0$, exact spatially-periodic solutions with odd parity can be expressed in terms of the Jacobi’s elliptic sine, whose modulus $q$ is an intrinsic parameter of the family:

$$\psi(z,t) = \exp(-i\mu_{\text{sat}}t) [A \sin(\beta z, q) + B], \quad (A1)$$

where

$$B = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} \frac{g}{\delta g} > 0, \quad A = \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 + q^2}} B > 0, \quad (A2)$$

$$\mu_{\text{sn}} = -2 \frac{\delta g}{g} B^2 < 0, \quad \beta^2 = \frac{2}{(1 + q^2)} \frac{\delta g}{g} B^2.$$ 

In the limit of $q \to 1$, solution (A1) goes over into the kink (the same as found in Ref. [37]),

$$\psi(z,t) = \exp(-i\mu_{\text{kink}}t) [A \tanh(\beta z) + B], \quad (A3)$$

with parameters

$$A = B = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} \frac{g}{\delta g} > 0, \quad \mu_{\text{kink}} = -2 \frac{\delta g}{g} B^2, \quad \beta^2 = \frac{\delta g}{g} B^2. \quad (A4)$$

2. $\delta g/g < 0$

In the case when the inter-species MF attraction is stronger than the intra-species repulsion, resulting in $\delta g < 0$, spatially-periodic solutions are expressed in terms of even Jacobi’s elliptic functions, dn($x, q$) and cn($x, q$). First, it is

$$\psi(z,t) = \exp(-i\mu_{\text{sat}}t) [A \sinh(\beta z, q) + B], \quad (A5)$$

with the elliptic modulus taking all values $0 < q < 1$, other parameters being

$$B = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} \frac{g}{\delta g} < 0, \quad A = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{2 - q^2}} B > 0, \quad (A6)$$

$$\mu_{\text{dn}} = -2h^2 \frac{\delta g}{g} > 0, \quad \beta^2 = -\frac{2}{(2 - q^2)} \frac{\delta g}{g} B^2.$$
The second solution is expressed in terms of the elliptic cosine, with $q^2 > 1/2$:

$$
\psi(z, t) = \exp(-i\mu_{\text{bubble}} t)[A \operatorname{cn}(Bz, q) + B], \quad (A7)
$$

$$
B = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} \frac{g}{\delta g} < 0, \quad A = -\sqrt{2}B > 0, \quad (A8)
$$

$$
\mu_{\text{bubble}} = \beta^2 = -2 \frac{\delta g}{g} B^2 > 0. \quad (A9)
$$

In the limit of $q \to 1$, both solutions (A5) and (A7) carry over into a state of the “bubble” type [40], which changes the sign at two points (the same solution was reported as an “W-shaped soliton” in Ref. [37]):

$$
\psi(z, t) = \exp(-i\mu_{\text{bubble}} t)[A \operatorname{sech}(Bz) + B], \quad (A10)
$$

with parameters

$$
B = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi} \frac{g}{\delta g} < 0, \quad A = -\sqrt{2}B > 0. \quad (A11)
$$

**Appendix B: Analytical solutions for strongly asymmetric fundamental and dipole states**

Here we consider analytical solutions of Eqs. (7) with strong asymmetry, $N_1 \ll N_2$, which can be found under small-amplitude conditions, $n_1(z = 0) \ll n_2(z = 0) \ll n_0$. Then, cubic terms may be neglected in Eqs. (7), and approximation

$$
\sqrt{P}|\psi_1|^2 + P^{-1} |\psi_2|^2 \approx P^{-1/2} |\psi_2| \approx \mu_2 \psi_2
$$

is used to simplify Eq. (7) to the following equations for stationary states (9):

$$
\mu_1 \phi_1 = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2 \phi_1}{dz^2} - \frac{\sqrt{P}}{\pi} \phi_2 \phi_1, \quad (B1)
$$

$$
\mu_2 \phi_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2 \phi_2}{dz^2} - \frac{1}{\pi P^{3/2}} \phi_2^2. \quad (B2)
$$

The soliton solution of Eq. (B2) is obvious,

$$
\phi_2(z) = \frac{3\pi}{2} (-\mu_2) \frac{P^{3/2}}{\cosh^2 \left( \sqrt{-\mu_2/2} z \right)} \quad (B3)
$$

[solution (16) takes essentially the same form in the limit of $|\mu| \ll \mu_0$]. Then, the substitution of Eq. (B3) in Eq. (B1) makes it tantamount to the linear Schrödinger equation with the Pöschl-Teller potential [41]. The ground-state (GS) solution of Eq. (B1) for $\phi_1$, with arbitrary amplitude $\phi_1^{(0)}$,

$$
(\phi_1(z))_{GS} = \frac{\phi_1^{(0)}}{\cosh \left( \sqrt{-\mu_2/2} z \right)^2}. \quad (B4)
$$

exists with

$$
\gamma = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{24 P^2 + 1} - 1 \right). \quad (B5)
$$

In this case, the QD solutions are quasi-Gaussian objects [20]. Note that, in the symmetric system with $P = 1$, Eqs. (B3) and (B5) yield $\gamma = 2$ and $(\mu_1)_{GS} = \mu_2$, i.e., the eigenmode and eigenvalue coincide with their counterparts in the soliton solution (B3), while they are different in the asymmetric system, the GS level lying below or above the chemical potential of soliton (B3) at $g_1 > g_2$ and $g_1 < g_2$, respectively.

In Fig. 11, we compare a typical asymptotic solution given by Eqs. (B3) and (B4) with a numerically obtained GS solution for the same values of the parameters. It is seen that the analytical and numerical results match well.
with an arbitrary amplitude:

\[
(\phi_1(z))_{\text{dip}} = \frac{\phi_1^{(0)} \sinh(\sqrt{-\mu_2/2}z)}{[\cosh(\sqrt{-\mu_2/2}z)]^\gamma}, \tag{B7}
\]

where \( \gamma \) is the same as in Eq. (B3), the respective eigenvalue being

\[
(\mu_1)_{\text{dip}} = \left(\sqrt{24P^2 + 1} - 3\right)^2 \frac{\mu_2}{16}, \tag{B8}
\]

which is obviously higher than its GS counterpart (B6) [at \( P = 1 \), Eq. (B8) yields \((\mu_1)_{\text{dip}} = \mu_2/4\), and \((\mu_1)_{\text{dip}} \) falls below \( \mu_2 \) for \( P > \sqrt{2} \)]. Unlike the GS, the dipole mode exists not at all values of \( P \), but only for \( P > 1/\sqrt{3} \). Exactly at \( P = 1/\sqrt{3} \), one has \((\mu_1)_{\text{dip}} = 0\), and the dipole mode (B7), with \( \gamma = 1 \), is a delocalized one, \( \sim \tanh\left(\sqrt{-\mu_2/2}z\right) \).

Linear Schrödinger equation (B1) with the Pöschl-Teller potential may give rise to higher bound states of integer order \( \nu \) as well, with eigenvalues

\[
(\mu_1)_\nu = \left(\sqrt{24P^2 + 1} - (1 + 2\nu)\right)^2 \frac{\mu_2}{16}, \tag{B9}
\]

where \( \nu \) = 0 and 1 correspond to Eqs. (B6) and (B8), respectively, the \( \nu \)-th spate existing at \( P^2 > \nu (\nu + 1)/6 \). The number of such solutions is always finite.

Unlike solutions considered in Appendices A and C, the stability of solutions given by Eqs. (B3)-(B9) is obvious.

**Appendix C: Other exact solutions in the case of \( N_1 \ll N_2 \)**

Here we provide periodic solutions to the semi-linear system of Eqs. (B1) and (B2) in terms of Jacobi elliptic functions. In the limit of \( q \to 1 \), they go over into solutions given in the main text, in the form of Eqs. (B3)-(B7).

1. **Solution of Eq. (B2)**

An exact periodic solution of Eq. (B2) with the quadratic nonlinearity is

\[
\phi_2 = A[dn^2(\beta z, q) + p], \tag{C1}
\]

with

\[
\beta^2 = -\frac{\mu_2}{2\sqrt{1 - q + q^2}}, \quad A = -\frac{3\pi\mu_2 P^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{1 - q + q^2}}, \tag{C2}
\]

\[
p = \left(\frac{2 - q}{3}\right) + \sqrt{1 - q + q^2}. \tag{C2}
\]

In the limit of \( q \to 1 \), solution (C1) goes over into solution (B3). Note that \( p \) is vanishing in this limit, according to Eq. (C2).

2. **Solutions of Eq. (B1)**

We now show that, with \( \phi_2 \) given by Eq. (C1), linear equation (B1) \( \phi_1 \) has several particular solutions depending on the value of \( P \).

**Solutions For \( P^2 = 1/3 \)**

a. **Solution I**

It is easy to check that

\[
\phi_1 = \phi_1^{(0)} \text{dn}(\beta z, q) \tag{C3}
\]

is an exact solution to Eq. (B1), provided that

\[
p^2 = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \mu_1 = \left(\frac{\mu_2}{12}\right) \frac{2 - q + 2\sqrt{1 - q + q^2}}{\sqrt{1 - q + q^2}}. \tag{C4}
\]

b. **Solution II**

\[
\phi_1 = \phi_1^{(0)} \text{cn}(\beta z, q) \tag{C5}
\]

is an exact solution to Eq. (B1), provided that

\[
p^2 = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \mu_1 = \left(\frac{\mu_2}{12}\right) \frac{2q - 1 + 2\sqrt{1 - q + q^2}}{\sqrt{1 - q + q^2}}. \tag{C6}
\]

In the limit of \( q \to 1 \), solutions I and II go over into the solution Eq. (B4) with \( \gamma = 1 \) and \( \mu_1 = \mu_2/4 \).

c. **Solution III**

\[
\phi_1 = \phi_1^{(0)} \text{sn}(\beta z, q) \tag{C7}
\]

is an exact solution to Eq. (B1), provided that

\[
p^2 = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \mu_1 = \left(\frac{\mu_2}{12}\right) \frac{2\sqrt{1 - q + q^2} - (1 + q)}{\sqrt{1 - q + q^2}}. \tag{C8}
\]

In the limit of \( q \to 1 \), solution III goes over into the solution Eq. (B7) with \( \gamma = 1 \) and \( \mu_1 = 0 \).

**Solutions For \( P^2 = 1 \)**

d. **Solution IV**

It is easy to check that

\[
\phi_1 = \phi_1^{(0)} [dn^2(\beta z, q) + p] \tag{C9}
\]

is an exact solution to Eq. (B1), provided that

\[
p^2 = 1, \quad \mu_1 = \mu_2. \tag{C10}
\]
is an exact solution to Eq. (B1), provided that
\[ P^2 = 1, \quad \mu_1 = \left( \frac{\mu_2}{2} \right) q + \sqrt{1 - q + q^2} \sqrt{1 - q + q^2}. \]  
\[(C12)\]

In the limit of \( q = 1 \), solutions IV and V go over into solution Eq. (B4) with \( \gamma = 2 \) and \( \mu_1 = \mu_2 \).

e. Solution V
\[ \phi_1 = \phi_1^{(0)} \text{cn}(\beta z, q) \text{dn}(\beta z, q) \]  
\[(C13)\]
is an exact solution to Eq. (B1), provided that
\[ P^2 = 1, \quad \mu_1 = \left( \frac{\mu_2}{4} \right) 3(1 - q) + \sqrt{1 - q + q^2} \sqrt{1 - q + q^2}. \]  
\[(C14)\]
f. Solution VI
\[ \phi_1 = \phi_1^{(0)} \text{sn}(\beta z, q) \text{dn}(\beta z, q) \]  
\[(C15)\]
is an exact solution to Eq. (B1), provided that
\[ P^2 = 1, \quad \mu_1 = \left( \frac{\mu_2}{4} \right) 2\sqrt{1 - q + q^2} \sqrt{1 - q + q^2}. \]  
\[(C16)\]

In the limit of \( q \to 1 \), solutions VI and VII go over into (B7), with \( \gamma = 2 \) and \( \mu_1 = \mu_2/4 \).
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