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In his celebrated textbook, Quantum Mechanics-Nonrelativistic Theory, Landau argued that, for single particle systems in 1D, tunneling probability remains the same for a particle incident from the left or the right of a barrier. This left-right symmetry of tunneling probability holds regardless of the shape of the potential barrier. However, there are a variety of known cases which break this symmetry, e.g. when observing composite particles. First, we set about proving Landau’s argument, as no rigorous proof currently exists. We then computationally show breaking of the left-right tunneling symmetry for the Bose-Einstein condensates (BEC) in 1D, modeled by the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. By varying the parameter, g, of inter-particle interaction in the BEC, we demonstrate the transition from symmetric ($g = 0$) to asymmetric tunneling is a threshold phenomenon. Our computations employ experimentally feasible parameters such that these results may be experimentally demonstrated in the near future. We conclude by suggesting applications of the phenomena to design atomtronic diodes, synthetic gauge fields, Maxwell’s demons, and black-hole analogues.

I. INTRODUCTION

Tunneling is one of the most important quantum mechanical effects, underlying an extremely broad class of phenomena: nuclear fusion [1], ionization of atoms and molecules by strong laser fields [2], transport effects in condensed matter [3], single and two proton tunneling in large molecules [4], semiconductor technology based on resonant-tunneling [5], Josephson junctions [6], scanning tunneling microscopy [7], the Hawking radiation from a black hole [8], etc. Furthermore, the role of tunneling in biochemical processes is one of the fundamental questions addressed in the burgeoning field of quantum biology [9]. Moreover, it is speculated in quantum cosmology that tunneling is the mechanism which created the universe [10].

Given the many disciplines it touches on, the physics of tunneling is incredibly rich [11]. Despite this, textbooks on quantum mechanics limit the discussion only to the semi-classical (i.e., WKB) approximation to the probability of 1D tunneling $\Gamma$ (see, e.g., Sec. 50 of Ref. [12]) through a potential barrier $V(x)$ for a quantum particle with energy $E$ and mass $m$,

$$\Gamma \propto \exp \left[ -\frac{2}{\hbar} \int_{b}^{c} \sqrt{2m(V(x) - E)} \, dx \right], \quad (1)$$

see Fig. 1 for an illustration. This formula is responsible for a widely held belief that tunneling probability is exponentially small. It is important to note that the probability of tunneling exponentially depends on the area under the curve between the potential barrier and particle’s energy.

Perhaps counterintuitively, Landau suggested (Sec. 25 of Ref. [12]) that transmission probabilities are symmetric in 1D according to the time-independent Schrödinger equation. In other words, a particle incident upon some potential barrier would have the exact same tunneling probability, regardless of if it approached the barrier from the right or the left: In the case when more than one degree of freedom (d.o.f.) is involved however, this no longer works. For example, interactions between different d.o.f. in a complex system may enhance or suppress tunneling rates compared to the case when no interactions are present [13]. This can lead to an emergent dynamical asymmetry in the tunneling of a composite system [14], such that tunneling becomes more probable than flying above a barrier for a large class of potentials [15]. These works remain largely unknown and we are extending their insight to experimentally accessible systems. This is especially true given recent experimental advances in Bose-Einstein condensates (BEC’s), enabling researchers to directly observe the tunneling of complex systems for the first time [6, 14, 17]. In addition, extensive computational research has been done with BEC tunneling, both using mean-field [16] and many-body [25] theories.

In the current work, we study the breaking of tunneling symmetry with BEC’s modeled by the Gross-Pitaevskii Equation (GPE). The GPE is a non-linear equation used to describe weakly interacting BEC’s, where the non-linearity models the interaction between particles of the Bose gas. The Schrödinger equation, and resulting linearity, can be recovered simply by reducing the interaction parameter to zero.
II. PROOF OF SYMMETRIC TUNNELING WITH THE 1D SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

It is relatively easy to show within the time-independent 1D Schrödinger equation that the probability of tunneling from left to right equals the probability of tunneling in the opposite direction if the barrier is symmetric, i.e., an even function of the coordinate \( \psi(x) = \psi(-x) \). Generalising this, Landau gave an intuition as to why tunneling remains symmetric for an arbitrary potential (see Sec. 25 of Ref. \[12\]). To the best of our knowledge, this statement has not been rigorously established. We ought to ensure that the symmetric nature of tunneling for single particles is well established, and not a tacit assumption. Furthermore, reverse engineering tunneling problems shall make it possible to design barriers with highly exotic and counter-intuitive properties \[30\].

Before proving Landau’s statement, we note that because we only examine the dynamics generated by a time-independent Hamiltonian, any solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger Eq. is a linear combinations of the eigen-solutions to the time-independent Schrödinger Eq. Therefore, we find it sufficient to move forward examining only the time-independent case.

We begin the proof by considering the wave function \( \Psi(x) \), a solution to the 1D time-independent Schrödinger equation with energy \( E \), incident upon a potential barrier \( U(x) \). The form of \( U(x) \) consists of three separable sections (see Fig. \[1\]: \( U(x) = 0 \) within sections (I) and (III); whereas in section (II), \( U(x) \) takes the form of some arbitrary barrier, \( U_C(x) \). We will define our origin such that \( U_C(x) \) spans the range of \(-a \leq x \leq a\). Within section (II), as for a second-order differential equation, the solution \( \psi(x) \) of the time-independent Schrödinger equation can be written as a linear combination of two linearly independent solutions, \( \psi_1(x) \) and \( \psi_2(x) \). For a wave incident moving from left (negative \( x \)) to right (positive \( x \)), the complete solution to the time-independent Schrödinger equation then takes the following form:

\[
\Psi_L(x) = \begin{cases} 
  e^{ikx} + B_L e^{-ikx} & \text{for } -\infty < x \leq -a \\
  C_1 \psi_1(x) + C_2 \psi_2(x) & \text{for } -a \leq x \leq a \\
  D_L e^{ikx} & \text{for } a \leq x < \infty,
\end{cases}
\]

(2)

where \( k = \frac{1}{\hbar} \sqrt{2m(E)} \).

For a wave incident from the right, the solution reads

\[
\Psi_R(x) = \begin{cases} 
  D_R e^{-ikx} & \text{for } -\infty < x \leq -a \\
  C_1 \psi_1(x) + C_2 \psi_2(x) & \text{for } -a \leq x \leq a \\
  e^{-ikx} + B_R e^{ikx} & \text{for } a \leq x < \infty.
\end{cases}
\]

(3)

From this we define the reflection and transmission probabilities as \( R_L = |B_L|^2 \) and \( T_L = |D_L|^2 \) respectively for the wave incident from the left, and similarly \( R_R = |B_R|^2 \) and \( T_R = |D_R|^2 \) for the wave incident from the right. In order to calculate the probabilities, we use the condition that the solutions of the Schrödinger equation must be continuously differentiable. Using the relations from \[2\] and their first derivatives at the boundary \( x = \pm a \), we generate the following system of four equations and four unknowns for the case of a wave incident from the left:

\[
\begin{align*}
  e^{-ika} + B_L e^{ika} &= C_1 \psi_1(-a) + C_2 \psi_2(-a), \\
  ik(e^{-ika} - B_L e^{ika}) &= C_1 \psi'_1(-a) + C_2 \psi'_2(-a), \\
  D_L e^{ika} &= C_1 \psi_1(a) + C_2 \psi_2(a), \\
  ikD_L e^{ika} &= C_1 \psi'_1(a) + C_2 \psi'_2(a).
\end{align*}
\]

(4)
By rearranging and applying Cramer’s rule, we obtain
\[
B_L = \frac{\text{num}_{B_L}}{\text{den}_L}, \quad D_L = \frac{\text{num}_{D_L}}{\text{den}_L},
\]
(5)
\[
den_L = e^{2ika} \left[ ik \left( \psi_1(-a)\psi_2(a) - \psi_1(-a)\psi_2'(a) \right) \\
+ \psi_2(-a)\psi_1'(a) - \psi_2'(-a)\psi_1(a) \\
+ \left( \psi_1'(a)\psi_2'(a) - \psi_1'(a)\psi_2(a) \right) \\
+ k^2 \psi_2(-a)\psi_1(a) - k^2 \psi_1(-a)\psi_2(a) \right],
\]
(6)
\[
\text{num}_{B_L} = ik \left( - \psi_1(-a)\psi_2(a) + \psi_2(-a)\psi_1(a) \\
- \psi_1(-a)\psi_2'(a) + \psi_2(-a)\psi_1'(a) \\
+ \left( \psi_1'(a)\psi_2'(a) - \psi_1'(a)\psi_2(a) \right) \\
+ k^2 \psi_2(-a)\psi_1(a) - k^2 \psi_1(-a)\psi_2(a) \right),
\]
(7)
\[
\text{num}_{D_L} = -2ik \left( \psi_2'(a)\psi_1(a) - \psi_2(a)\psi_1'(a) \right).
\]
(8)
Note that Eq. (6) contains the Wronskian, \( \psi_2(x)\psi_1(x) - \psi_2(x)\psi_1'(x) \). By repeating the same process for \( \Psi(x) \) incident from the right, we obtain solutions in a similar form
\[
B_R = \frac{\text{num}_{B_R}}{\text{den}_R}, \quad D_R = \frac{\text{num}_{D_R}}{\text{den}_R},
\]
(9)
\[
den_R = -e^{2ika} \left[ ik \left( \psi_1'(a)\psi_2'(a) - \psi_1'(a)\psi_2(a) \right) \\
+ \psi_2'(a)\psi_1(a) - \psi_2'(a)\psi_1(a) \\
+ \left( \psi_1'(a)\psi_2'(a) - \psi_1'(a)\psi_2(a) \right) \\
+ k^2 \psi_2(-a)\psi_1(a) - k^2 \psi_1(-a)\psi_2(a) \right],
\]
(10)
\[
\text{num}_{B_R} = ik \left( - \psi_1'(a)\psi_2'(a) + \psi_2'(a)\psi_1'(a) \\
- \psi_1'(a)\psi_2(a) + \psi_2'(a)\psi_1(a) \\
- \left( \psi_1'(a)\psi_2'(a) - \psi_1'(a)\psi_2(a) \right) \\
- k^2 \psi_2(-a)\psi_1(a) + k^2 \psi_2(-a)\psi_1(a) \right),
\]
(11)
\[
\text{num}_{D_R} = 2ik \left( \psi_2'(a)\psi_1(-a) - \psi_2(-a)\psi_1'(a) \right).
\]
(12)
From these results, we see \( |\text{den}_L|^2 = |\text{den}_R|^2 \) and \( |\text{num}_{B_L}|^2 = |\text{num}_{B_R}|^2 \), and accordingly \( R_L = R_R \); moreover,
\[
|\text{num}_{D_L}|^2 = 4k^2 \left( \psi_2'(a)\psi_1(a) - \psi_2(a)\psi_1'(a) \right)^2,
\]
(13)
\[
|\text{num}_{D_R}|^2 = 4k^2 \left( \psi_2'(-a)\psi_1(-a) - \psi_2(-a)\psi_1'(a) \right)^2.
\]
(14)
Since the time-independent Schrödinger equation does not contain the first derivative, the Wronskian is constant for all values of \( x \) as per Abel’s identity.

### III. PRINCIPLE OF ASYMMETRIC TUNNELING BEYOND THE SINGLE-PARTICLE CASE

Now that the 1D symmetric tunneling is proven, we turn our attention to scenarios which may break this symmetry. In the overlooked Ref. 14, it was shown that tunneling can become asymmetric for the case of a two-particle system. Let us give the intuition behind this phenomenon. First, recall that the dynamics generated by a time-independent Hamiltonian conserves the total energy. To understand the underlying physics of the two-particle system, it is convenient to represent it using the center of mass (C. M.) and inter-particle d.o.f. A tunneling barrier then couples these two d.o.f.

Consider a triangular potential barrier as depicted in Fig. 2(a). Assume that the inter-particle d.o.f. is initially in the lowest energy (i.e., ground) state as the wave packet approaches the angled side of the potential barrier, as shown Fig. 2(a). As the system moves from the left to right, the potential barrier gradually builds up. According to the adiabatic theorem, the inter-particle d.o.f. will not be excited; hence, tunneling dynamics of the two-particle system effectively resembles the 1D case (Fig. 1) since the inter-particle d.o.f. is frozen. A very different dynamical process takes place when the wave packet approaches the vertical side of the triangular barrier, as shown in Fig. 2(b). Upon colliding with the edge of
the barrier, the inter-particle d.o.f. experiences a sudden shakeup, which induces the change of state. Since the inter-particle d.o.f. is originally in the ground state, the only allowed transition is to the excited state. The total energy, which is the sum of the center of mass and inter-particle energies, is conserved, hence the excitation takes place by decreasing the center of mass kinetic energy. As a result, the center of mass d.o.f. effectively plunges deeper under the potential barrier, as depicted in Fig. 2(b). The gray shaded regions in Figs. 2(a, b) denote the areas, whose negative exponent is related to tunneling probability as shown in Fig. 1 and Eq. (1). Thus, we achieve asymmetric tunneling since the probability of tunneling from left to right [Fig. 2(a)] is larger than the right-left probability [Fig. 2(b)].

The preceding description of asymmetric tunneling has been done within the Schrödinger equation for a two-particle system, where the asymmetric tunneling resulted from the coupling of the center of mass and inter-particle d.o.f. While we expect that this intuition of broken symmetry is realizable in other, multi-particle systems [32, 33], we are interested in the counterintuitive case of a system which behaves like a single particle. To this end, we examine the case of a BEC, which behaves in many aspects like a single particle system since the majority of its \( N \) particles occupy the same quantum state.

IV. NUMERICAL DEMONSTRATION OF ASYMMETRIC TUNNELING OF 1D BEC

For the evaluation of the BEC dynamics in a mean-field approximation, we utilize the time-dependent Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE), which may be written in 1D as

\[
\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial \Psi(x,t)}{\partial t} = \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) + g |\Psi(x,t)|^2 \right) \Psi(x,t),
\]

or

\[
\mu \Psi(x) = \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) + g |\Psi(x)|^2 \right) \Psi(x),
\]

in its time-independent form, where \( g \) is the interaction parameter which models the interactions between bosons and \( \mu \) is the chemical potential [34]. In order to better compare the transmission probabilities of the single particle Schrödinger equation and the GPE, we choose to normalize the state to \( \int |\Psi(x,t)|^2 \, dx = 1 \) so that the normalized probability of the GPE agrees with the normalized predictions of the Schrödinger equation. Thus, the full expression of the interaction parameter is

\[
g = 4\pi Na_s \hbar^2 / m,
\]

where \( a_s \) is the scattering length of the BEC, and \( m \) is the mass of the individual bosons. We use the background scattering length [35] value, \( a_{bg} = 100 a_0 \), \( a_0 = 5.29 \times 10^{-11} \) m, and mass of \( ^{87}\text{Rb} \), \( m = 1.44 \times 10^{-25} \) kg.

For modeling the 1D behavior, we imagine the 3D BEC to be tightly confined in the \( y- \) and \( z- \) directions by a harmonic trap of angular frequency \( \omega_y = \omega_z = 1000\pi \) Hz, and weakly trapped along the \( x- \) direction by a shallow trap of angular frequency \( \omega_x = 100\pi \) Hz. We use these frequencies to define the characteristic lengths,

\[
L_i = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m \omega_i}}
\]

for \( i = x, y, z \). Utilizing these lengths, frequencies, and known constants, we introduce the dimensionless quantities:

\[
\tau = t \omega_x,
\]

\[
\xi = x/L_x,
\]

\[
\tilde{V}(\xi) = V(x) k_B / \hbar \omega_x,
\]

\[
\tilde{g} = \frac{g}{\hbar \omega_x 2 \pi L_x L_y L_z},
\]

\[
\tilde{\Psi}(\xi, \tau) = \Psi(x, t) \sqrt{L_x L_y L_z},
\]

where \( \hbar \omega_x / k_B = 2.4 \times 10^{-3} \mu K \), \( L_x = 1.5 \) \( \mu \)m, and \( L_y = L_z = 0.48 \) \( \mu \)m.

We consider a BEC of \( N = 10^4 \) particles trapped by the following quadratic potential centered around an offset \( \xi_0 \)

\[
\tilde{V}_{\text{trap}}(\xi) = v_0 (\xi - \xi_0)^2,
\]

where \( v_0 \) is a scaling parameter for how tightly we set the trap, and (see Eq. (20) for unit conversion). The ground state of Eq. (16) in the trapping potential [35] is obtained via the imaginary time propagation and used as the initial condition at \( t = 0 \) for the time evolution of GPE. Despite the moderate number of atoms, the ground state reasonably matches the one of the Thomas-Fermi Approximation,

\[
|\Psi(x)|^2 = \frac{\mu - V(x)}{g},
\]

where the kinetic energy in Eq. (16) is assumed to be vanishing. In Eq. (20), \( \mu \) is taken to be the numerically calculated chemical potential for the ground state. Plotting all positive values of \( (\mu - V(x)) / g \), we see in Fig. 3 very good agreement of the calculated density of the ground state with the Thomas-Fermi approximation.

A. Single-pass asymmetric tunneling

In this section, the simple 1D case of a BEC traveling incident upon an asymmetric barrier is investigated. This approach will demonstrate the asymmetries in BEC behavior after a single pass, since the BEC only interacts
with the barrier once. The asymmetric barrier is formed by a series of fixed width Gaussians of varying intensity and could be realized by a time-averaged technique as experimentally done in references [36–38]:

\[
\tilde{V}(\xi) = 45e^{-(\xi+15)^2/144.5} + 31.5e^{-\xi^2/144.5} + 13.5e^{-(\xi-15)^2/144.5}.
\] (27)

In Fig. 4, the barrier is shown along with the regions for calculating tunneling probability. We begin with a starting offset of \(\xi_0 = -65\), or \(x = -99.1\mu\text{m}\), and a scale of \(v_0 = 0.5\) for the initial trap. The ground state of the BEC is then released by turning-off this trap and "kicking" the condensate to give it an initial velocity towards the barrier. In this case, the initial wavefunction reads

\[
\tilde{\Psi}(\xi, \tau = 0) = e^{i\kappa\xi}\tilde{\Psi}_g(\xi),
\] (28)

such that the state will now propagate from left to right. With a kick parameter of \(\kappa = 6.5\), we allow the BEC to propagate for a time \(\tau = 10.55\), or \(t = 33.6\text{ms}\) using both the GPE (Fig. 5) and the Schrödinger equation (Fig. 6) for comparison. This time ensures that the BEC has sufficiently propagated such that it has either reflected off or tunneled through the barrier. In the case of Fig. 5 (A), the BEC meets the sharper side of the barrier first and is more likely to experience a sudden excitation as a result. This lowers the transmission probability, as the excitation requires energies part of the BEC’s center of mass energy. We then repeat this process for the flipped case (Fig. 5 B), preparing the BEC at \(x = 99.1\mu\text{m}\) and then applying the same magnitude kick to the opposite direction. This time, the BEC sees a much shallower increase in the potential barrier, and accordingly has a lower probability of excitation, meaning a higher CoM energy. Accordingly we expect that the tunneling probability is higher in this case. We repeat the same numerical experiments in Fig. 6 for a BEC with vanishing inter-species interactions to highlight their role.

In this single pass case, we see the tunneling probabilities of Fig. 7 diverge at \(t = 19.5\text{ (ms)}\) and remain diverged, marked by asymmetry in the density plots. To quantify tunneling asymmetry in the interacting BEC case [Fig. 7 (B)]. As a reference, the Schrödinger case is shown in Fig. 7 (A). We introduce the following metric

\[
d_r = \frac{|T_L - T_R|}{(T_L + T_R)/2} \times 100%,
\] (29)

where \(T_R\) is the tunneling probability that the BEC incident from the left and will tunnel through to the right, and \(T_L\) is the tunneling probability of the BEC incident from the right tunneling through to the left. These probabilities are calculated by integrating \(|\Psi(x, t)|^2\) over the shaded regions seen in Fig. 7 with \(T_R\) corresponding to the blue shaded region to the right of the potential and \(T_L\) corresponding to the orange region to the left of the potential. These regions are chosen such that interactions between the wavefunction and the barrier are not counted.

According to Fig. 7 (A), the Schrödinger equation shows identical tunneling probabilities from either side. This is reinforced by the relative difference maximum of \(d_r = 0.5%\) seen in Fig. 8 corresponding to tunneling
FIG. 5. (A)-(B) Evolution plots of a BEC modelled by the GPE, where (A) is the BEC prepared on the left and kicked to the right and (B) is the BEC initially on the right and kicked to the left. Unlike the predictions of the single particle Schrödinger equation, we see significant spreading of the BEC as it propagates. This is the expected behavior of a self-interactive, multi-particle system.

FIG. 6. (A)-(B) Evolution plots of a BEC with vanishing interactions, where (A) is the BEC prepared on the left and kicked to the right and (B) is the BEC initially on the right and kicked to the left. Due to the low predicted energy, the BEC largely reflects off the barrier.

to better examine the asymmetric behavior, a different showcase is considered in the following sections.

B. Recurrent Asymmetric Tunneling

In a trap, the long-term behavior of a tunneling BEC can be better investigated without suffering from insufficient grid sizes. Moreover, this allows to examine multiple instances of tunneling in an arrangement that could be experimentally explored by painted potentials. Accordingly, we choose the parameters such that our asymmetric potential may be created by a series of fixed-width probabilities on the order of $10^{-8}$ and numerical fluctuations on the order of $10^{-10}$. The GPE, however, predicts that the two probabilities diverge, as seen in Fig. 7 (B). We see that these probabilities continue to rise, while $d_r$ decreases as the overall tunneling probability increases. At this point, however, we stop the simulation due to resolution constraints. Overall, the GPE predicts a peak asymmetry of $d_r = 57\%$ when the probabilities first begin to diverge at $t = 18.6$ ms, and a final asymmetry of $d_r = 1.2\%$ at $t = 33.6$ ms (Fig. 8). Ultimately this gives a confirmation of asymmetry, but does not show a clear method to obtaining high asymmetries. In order
FIG. 7. (A) Tunneling probability for a BEC modelled by the Schrödinger equation. The order of tunneling probability is very low due to the lower predicted energy. We do see complete overlap of tunneling probabilities, which is expected. (B) Tunneling probability for a BEC modelled by the GPE. While the difference is small, there is a clear split between the left to right probability vs. the right to left. We see that our intuition from Fig. 2 holds, as the more gradual side of the barrier has slightly higher tunneling probability. Note that the colors are synchronized to the potential plot 4, with the left to right Schrödinger / GPE corresponding to the blue shaded region and the right to left Schrödinger / GPE corresponding to the orange shaded region.

FIG. 8. Relative difference between tunneling probabilities modeled by the Schrödinger equation and the GPE. Note that, for the Schrödinger case, the order of tunneling probability is $10^{-8}$. We do see minor fluctuation on the order of $\approx 0.1\%$ difference in tunneling probability, disregarded as numerical noise. For the case of the GPE, we see a spike of $d_r = 57\%$ at the peak, which is where the tunneling probabilities reach the initial point of diversion. This reduces down to $d_r = 1\%$ by the cutoff time, showing that while the tunneling probabilities are asymmetric, a better method is needed to achieve higher asymmetries.

FIG. 9. The asymmetric barrier used in the second method. The dotted lines indicate the seven, fixed-width Gaussians used to create the potential, and the red line indicates the ground state energy of the BEC ($\approx 80$ nK). The shaded regions, again correspond to the region over which we integrate for probability of tunneling, with the blue shaded region corresponding to the BEC cooled on the left tunneling to the right and the orange shaded region corresponding to the probability of the flipped case.
form of the potential,
\[
\tilde{V}(\xi) = 400 - 285 \left( e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\xi+45)^2/144.5} + e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\xi-45)^2/144.5} + e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\xi+30)^2/144.5} + e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\xi-30)^2/144.5} - 242.25 e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\xi+15)^2/144.5} - e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\xi-15)^2/144.5} - 270.25 e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\xi-0.3)^2/144.5} \right).
\]

This potential (see Fig. 9) confines the BEC in a smooth well such that it will have multiple chances to reflect or tunnel through the asymmetric barrier in the center. Additionally, once tunneled through, particles on the other side of the barrier will then have a chance to tunnel back to their original side. Because the BEC is confined, we can then allow this to happen continuously over a long period of time, \( \tau = 40 \), or \( t \approx 127 \text{ ms} \). This allows larger disparities between left-right tunneling probabilities to form, highlighting the asymmetry of the dynamics. The BEC is prepared closer to the barrier than in the previous method with a much tighter trapping potential, choosing \( v_0 = 0.5 \) for the tightness parameter and \( \xi_0 = \pm 37 \), or \( x \approx 56 \mu \text{m} \) as offset for Eq. (25). Looking at the density plots in Fig. 10, we see oscillatory behavior expected from a trapped matterwave, but with added complexity arising from the repeated tunneling behavior.

Looking at the tunneling probabilities predicted by the GPE [Fig. 11 (B)], we see an initial divergence similar to that of the first method. However, given multiple passes, we see clear asymmetry resulting at \( t \approx 70 \text{ ms} \) and \( t \approx 120 \text{ ms} \). Astoundingly, \( d_r \), peaks at these times, with values \( \approx 85\% \) and \( \approx 75\% \) respectively. This clear asymmetry is nearly two orders of magnitude higher than the single-pass asymmetry.

FIG. 10. (A)-(B) Evolution plots of a BEC modelled by the GPE, where (A) is the case of BEC prepared on the left side of the trap and (B) the case of a BEC initially on the right side of the trap’s central barrier. Because particles of the BEC may tunnel from one side of the barrier to the other and then back, we notice that the tunneling probability may increase or decrease over time.

FIG. 11. (A) tunneling probability for a BEC modeled by the Schrödinger equation. (B) tunneling probability for a BEC modeled by the GPE. Because the BEC is trapped, it is able to propagate for \( t \approx 127 \text{ ms} \), which is much longer than the previous method. Note that the colors are synchronized to the potential plot 9, with the left to right Schrödinger / GPE corresponding to the blue shaded region and the right to left Schrödinger / GPE corresponding to the orange shaded region.
C. Transition from Symmetric to Asymmetric Tunneling

For a third method, we revisit our first, single pass case, but modify the barrier such that it becomes two identical asymmetric barriers. This creates a total asymmetric barrier which still allows the BEC multiple chances for tunneling or for reflection, as seen in Fig. 12. This may eventually be extended such that a larger number of barriers may act as a diode, allowing BEC’s to transmit from, say, left to right, while effectively eliminating the possibility that it travels right to left. While examining this third case, we also introduce scaling of the interaction parameter $g$ (Eq. 17) which may be accomplished experimentally using Feshbach resonance to scale the scattering length, $a_s$:

$$a_s(B) = \gamma a_{bg}, \text{ where } \gamma = 1 - \frac{\Delta}{B - B_0}. \quad (31)$$

Here we introduce the scaling factor $\gamma$ to simplify notation, which could, in principle, range from $\approx 0$ to arbitrarily high numbers. Alternatively, Eq. 17 shows that changing the number of particles accomplishes the same effect. While we consider both cases, it should be noted that manipulation of $g$ is more practically feasible through Feshbach resonance, as the scaling may be carried out without changing the sample BEC. The potential for this examination takes the form:

$$\tilde{V}(\xi) = \sum \text{coefficient} \cdot e^{-\left(\xi + \text{constant}\right)^2/\text{parameter}} \quad (32)$$

We perform 120 simulations, increasing $\gamma$ by steps of 0.01 over the interval $0 < \gamma \leq 0.50$ and by steps of 0.05 over the interval $0.50 < \gamma \leq 3.0$. Because of this number of individual simulations as well as the more complex nature of the barrier, we reduce distance between the initial state’s offset and the center of the asymmetric barrier, with each state being prepared in a potential with $v_0 = 0.5$ and $x_0 = \pm 76.3 \mu m$. As compared to previous simulations, we reduce the time of propagation to $t = 11.14$ ms and coordinate range of $x$ to $\pm 152.5 \mu m$. Accordingly, we increase the kick applied to the BEC to $\kappa = 22$ such that it propagates faster. This provides adequate resolution to demonstrate the relationship between tunneling probability at the final time, $t = 11.14$ ms, and $a_s$ shown in Fig. 13. In the case of $g = a_s = 0$, the symmetric tunneling is restored as expected. It is most surprising, though, that the relationship between the tunneling probability and $a_s$ exhibits a threshold-like behavior, where the tunneling probabilities remain symmetric and close to 0 for the lowest values of the scattering length $a_s$ but increase and become asymmetric above a certain value.

![Fig. 12](image1.png)

**FIG. 12.** A two peak asymmetric barrier which offers multiple chances for transmission and reflection. As with previous plots, the blue shaded region corresponds to the case in which we cool the BEC on the left of the asymmetric barrier at $x = -76.3 \mu m$ and kick the BEC such that it propagates to the right. The orange shaded region corresponds to the probability of the flipped case, where we instead cool the BEC at $x = 76.3 \mu m$ and kick it such that it propagates to the left.
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**FIG. 13.** Prepared at the same location, this plot shows the difference between tunneling probabilities for 120 trials of varying scattering lengths (e.g., via a magnetically tunable Feshbach resonance). As with previous methods, the plots are color coded to match Fig. 12.

V. CONCLUSION

Through several examples, we have demonstrated the asymmetric tunneling of a BEC through asymmetric potentials in 1D. This is in contrast to the case of non-interacting particles described by the Schrödinger equation where tunneling has the left-right symmetry even for asymmetric barriers, as we have rigorously proven.

There is much room to optimize barrier shapes and scattering length to boost asymmetry to steer dynamics
of BEC, which is a direct expansion upon efforts to optimize scattering length to control transmission [24]. This may enable atomtronic diodes [40] and facilitate BEC driven interferometers [11].

Asymmetric tunneling also suggests a new approach for experimental implementation of synthetic gauge fields [42, 43]. Gauge fields are the building blocks of the Standard Model. Their unique physics have opened new horizons in topological quantum matter and technology, attracting a significant effort to engineer gauge fields in the laboratory. The complexity of the current experimental setups results from the assumption that tunneling is symmetric [42, 43]. The presented asymmetric tunneling dynamics suggests a simpler implementation: At the bottom of a deep ring-shaped trap, arrange several asymmetric barriers while preserving their orientation, such that the vertical side of one triangular barrier abuts the angled side of the next triangle (similar to Fig. 2). This trap should exhibit a strong left-right asymmetry in the transmission probability, thereby inducing a chiral motion into the BEC. This is a signature of synthetic gauge fields, with the chiral current appearing as if it were induced by a magnetic field.

A black hole analogue in BEC may also be created by asymmetric tunneling overlying self-trapping. Recall that when a wave packet is placed on one side of a symmetric double well potential, the Schrödinger equation predicts that the wave packet undergoes recurrent oscillatory tunneling between the two wells. However, for sufficiently strong inter-particle interactions, a BEC placed on one side of the symmetric double well potential will remain trapped. This phenomenon is known as self-trapping [6, 13, 14]. Our findings suggest that it should be possible to find a value of the scattering length and an asymmetric double well barrier such that when the condensate placed in one well it will be able to tunnel to the other but not be able to tunnel back by remaining self-trapped.

We want to point out that self-trapping and asymmetric tunneling are two complementary phenomena. The self-trapping reveals asymmetric dynamics of BEC even in a symmetric potential; hence, it is natural to expect asymmetric tunneling through a non-symmetric barrier.

A Maxwell’s demon may also be implemented via asymmetric tunneling since the latter is sensitive to the state of the inter-particle d.o.f. As discussed in Sec. III, the left-to-right tunneling probability [Fig. 2(a)] is smaller than the right-to-left probability [Fig. 2(b)] when the inter-particle d.o.f. is initially in the ground state. This asymmetry is reversed when the system is initially in the exited state. According to Fig. 2(b), the angled side of the triangular barrier builds adiabatically, leaving the inter-particle state unchanged, and hence the two-particle system behaves effectively as a 1D system. If the excited inter-particle d.o.f. hits the vertical side of the barrier [Fig. 2(d)], the resulting shakeup forces a state transition. One possibility is for the inter-particle d.o.f. to reduce to the ground state. The energy difference will be transferred to the kinetic energy of the center of mass in order to preserve the total energy, hence the system will be able to fly above the barrier as shown in Fig. 2(d). Comparing Figs. 2(a) and 2(c), we conclude that if the wavepacket is initially placed on the left side of the barrier then transport rates across the barrier is insensitive to the initial state of the inter-particle d.o.f. Conversely, the transport rates shown in Figs. 2(b) and 2(d), are very sensitive to the state of the inter-particle d.o.f. In this case it is much more likely for the system initially in the excited state cross the barrier than the system is the ground state. Hence, the triangular barrier with the vertical side facing the wavepacket should act as a Maxwell’s demon.
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