

Anti-inertia and antigravity in quantum systems

Lijia Jiang and Jun-Hui Zheng

Institute of Modern Physics, Northwest University, 710069 Xi'an, China

The law of inertia is one of the cornerstones of classical physics. Yet how inertia works in quantum systems remains unclear. Here, we investigate the anomalous inertial behaviors of quantum matter and related exotic gravitational effects in quantum systems. In finite-size systems, we demonstrate that the (topological) excitations could be anti-gravitic for the one-particle case or Bose-Einstein condensate case. We show that antigravity also implies the appearance of anti-inertia, and illustrate that these bizarre phenomena are consequences of a principle called ‘quantum-state exclusion’. Physically, these quantum systems realize antigravity by changing the momentum distribution of particles inside. Moreover, we prove that the expansion of quantum matter can be accelerated instead of slowed by gravitation. As a result, in a system with expanding space, quantum matter can expand even faster than the space in the presence of gravitation. These unique phenomena in quantum systems are possible to be observed in ultracold atom experiments, and may shed new light on explaining the accelerated expansion of the universe.

Inertia is an extremely important concept in classical physics, which relates not only to the law of motion of objects, the laws of conservation of energy and momentum, but also to the translational symmetry of spacetime. On the other hand, in the famous Einstein’s elevator experiment, the indistinguishability between inertial motion and the free fall of an object in a gravitational field germinated the equivalence between the gravitational mass and inertial mass. This equivalence became the basis of general relativity that unifies inertia, gravity, and curved spacetime [1]. The meeting of gravity and quantum mechanics suffers enormous difficulties. Establishing a complete and consistent quantum theory of gravity remains challenging [2]. On the other hand, exploring how gravity and inertia affect quantum systems has never been stopped. For instance, the equivalence principle in quantum systems and gravity-induced phase shift of matter waves have been extensively studied over decades [3–15]. However, the effects of gravity and inertia in quantum systems that have been unveiled hitherto, are only tips of the iceberg.

In Fig. 1, we take the motions of objects in an elevator in the weightless environment as examples. In the classical case, when the elevator starts accelerating upwards, the ball (with vanish initial velocity) inside moves downwards and the bubble of gas in the water moves upwards in the view of the elevator. Switching to the quantum case, when the passenger in the elevator is a quantum particle that behaves as a matter wave, will the particle also move downwards when the elevator is accelerated? Or for the many-body case, assuming the liquid is Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) and the bubble inside it is a dark soliton, how do the center of mass of the BEC and the position of the soliton change?

In this article, we devote to investigate the anomalous inertial behaviors of quantum matter and related exotic gravitational effects in nonrelativistic quantum systems. We start with the simplest case that a single particle is confined in an accelerated moving one-dimensional trap. It has been proved that a quantum system with acceleration $g\mathbf{e}_x$ can be equivalently described by a stationary




FIG. 1. Schematic diagram of inertial phenomena in classical and quantum systems. In the weightless environment, in the view of the elevator, the classical ball moves downwards and the bubble of gas in the water moves upwards when the elevators are accelerating. However, when the passenger in the elevator is a matter wave or a Bose-Einstein condensate with a soliton, how inertia works is not clear.

system in a gravitational field $\mathbf{G} = -g\mathbf{e}_x$ [8]. Thus, in the comoving coordinate of the trap, the evolution of the state of the trapped particle follows the time-independent Schrödinger equation with an additional linear gravitational potential,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + [V(x) + mgx] \phi, \quad (1)$$

where $V(x)$ is the potential function of the trap.




FIG. 2. a) The probability density distribution $|\phi_n|^2$ for the first three levels in an infinite square well for $g = 0$ and 30 , respectively. b) The center of mass x_c as functions of the gravitational field strength g . c) The density distribution function in momentum space for the states $n = 0$ and 1 . In our calculation, the units for the position x is the width of the well L . The units for the momentum k and the field strength g are \hbar/L and \hbar^2/m^2L^3 , respectively.

Antigravity in single-particle systems

In the following, we employ a one-dimensional infinite square well to modeling the elevator. We plot the probability density distribution $|\phi_n|^2$ of the steady-state solutions of Eq. (1) in Fig. 2a, which exhibits substantial changes when gravity is present. Specifically, the density distribution of the ground state is pulled down to reduce the gravitational potential energy. For excitations, the wavefunction nodes where $\phi_n = 0$, move downwards, indicating that the average wavelength of the matter wave above the node becomes longer than that below. This corresponds to the gravitational redshift effect of matter waves [11–14], which originates from the fact that the kinetic energy converts into the gravitational potential energy as the particle moves upwards inside the elevator. Moreover, the peaks of the probability density of the excitations, are enhanced at the upper part but suppressed at the lower part due to the existence of the gravitational field. This result may indicate that the particle favors moving upwards when gravity is present.

To confirm this conjecture, in Fig. 2b, we plot the center of mass $x_c \equiv \langle \phi_n | \hat{x} | \phi_n \rangle$ as a function of the gravitational field strength g for the first several steady states. If we further assume that the field strength increases over time from zero and that this process is so slow that the system remains at the same energy level adiabatically, then the curves $x_c(g(t))$ also represent the trajectory of the center of mass of the particle in the elevator. On the other hand, the derivative $\chi = \delta x_c / \delta g$ displays the gravitic susceptibility of the state, i.e., the response of the center of mass to a small change of the field strength. The states are classified to be para-gravitic and anti-gravitic according to the sign of χ , which correspond to the phenomena that the center of mass sinks ($\chi < 0$) and rises ($\chi > 0$) when increasing g , respectively. From the figure, we find that in contrast to the para-gravitic ground

state, the excitations are all anti-gravitic in the relative weak gravity regime and they turn to be para-gravitic in sequence if and only if the gravity becomes sufficiently strong. Because of the equivalence of descriptions, this phenomenon of antigravity also implies the emergence of anti-inertia, i.e., the excitations (in a gravity-free environment) will move even faster than the elevator, when the elevator starts accelerating upwards slowly.

The antigravity behaviors are counter-intuitive, so they are doubted frequently whether the law of energy conservation is kept [16]. Thus, before explaining the origin of antigravity, we illustrate the rationality of anti-gravity in quantum systems. In the differential form, the work on the particle contributed by gravity due to the change of field strength is $\delta W = -mg\delta x_c$. By denoting the corresponding change of kinetic energy as δE_k and the change of the wavefunction as $\delta\phi_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E_k - \delta W &= \langle \delta\phi_n | \left(\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + mg\hat{x} \right) | \phi_n \rangle + c.c. \\ &= \varepsilon_n (\langle \delta\phi_n | \phi_n \rangle + c.c.) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where ε_n is the eigenenergy for the state ϕ_n . The work done by gravity totally transfers into the change of kinetic energy, obeying the law of energy conservation.

When increasing g slowly, the total work done by gravity is $W = -m \int g dx_c$, where the integral is exactly the area left covered by the curve $x_c(g)$ (see the shadows in Figs. 2b). The work is positive for the ground state, but negative for excitations for relatively small g . It is worth stressing that, due to the non-monotonicity of the function $x_c(g)$ for excitations, the work can be different even when the center of mass is shifted by a same distance (see the cases A and B shown in the figure), and a positive x_c does not always mean that the work done by gravity is negative.

To see how the kinetic energy of the particle is changed,

in Figs. 2c, we plot the particle's probability density distribution in momentum space. For the excitation $n = 1$, the probability density in the low-momentum regime is enhanced by gravity and that in the high-momentum regime is suppressed, which is contrary to the gravity effect on the ground state. If we interpret kinetic energy as the system's internal energy (like as in thermodynamic systems), then the excitation lifts its gravitational potential energy by releasing its internal energy, inducing the anti-gravitational phenomena. Or we can say, a quantum particle realizes antigravity by 'cooling' itself. This is unique for quantum systems, because the quantum state always has finite kinetic energy due to the uncertainty principle to make it possible to cool.

The intrinsic mechanism of antigravity

In the following, we illustrate that antigravity is ubiquitous in quantum systems and its emergence is guaranteed by an intrinsic mechanism. Note that for quantum systems with *arbitrary finite size*, the arithmetic mean of the center of mass over all eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, $\langle x_c \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}[\hat{x}]/\text{Tr}[\hat{1}] = \int x dx / \int dx$, is well defined and is invariant against any disturbance. Therefore, the average shift of the center of mass by gravity over all eigenstates remains zero. As a result, it is not allowed that states are all para-gravitic or all anti-gravitic in finite-size quantum systems. We name this principle as *quantum-state exclusion*. This exclusion stems from the orthogonality and completeness of quantum states. It is an intrinsic property of states, no matter whether the states are occupied and whether the particle is boson or fermion. This is quite different from the Pauli exclusion principle, which describes the rule of occupying states for fermions. On the other hand, the ground state is always para-gravitic, because its gravitic susceptibility

$$\chi \equiv \frac{\delta \langle \phi_0 | \hat{x} | \phi_0 \rangle}{\delta g} = 2m \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{|\langle \phi_n | x | \phi_0 \rangle|^2}{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_n}, \quad (3)$$

is negative since $\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. Together with the quantum-state exclusion, it implies that some excitations must be anti-gravitic.

Observing antigravity in BEC systems

In the supplementary, we demonstrate that antigravity can not occur in thermal equilibrium systems. Therefore, the anti-gravitational phenomena are rarely observed in conventional macroscopic physics. To observe the phenomena of antigravity in experiments, it is necessary to excite the quantum system and measure the probability density distribution of the particle in space. Topologically excited BEC in cold atom systems are favorable for this purpose due to the following advantages. First, in experiments, topological excitations can be realized by using the phase imprinting technique [17–20] or produced as defects in quench dynamics of phase transition due to the Kibble-Zurek mechanism [21–27]. Second, the excitations are topologically (sometimes also symmetrically)

protected and thus they have extremely long lifetime [17]. Third, in BEC systems, all particles occupy a same state, so the probability density distribution of the particle in space is identical to the particle density distribution of the macroscopic BEC, which can be detected by absorption imaging technique in cold atom experiments [28–30].

Note that the BEC can be described by a single macroscopic wavefunction and its dynamics follows the Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) equation,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} + [V(x) + mgx] \Phi + \lambda |\Phi|^2 \Phi, \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ refers to the two-body repulsive interaction and Φ is normalized to one. The square well can be realized by using optical beams [31, 32]. The GP equation is a many-body extension of the Schrödinger equation. Numerically, we obtain steady and self-consistent solitonic solution Φ_n of this nonlinear equation by cyclic iteration, where n is the node number of wavefunctions. In many-body case, each node corresponds to a dark soliton. Even though the density peaks are suppressed by the repulsive interaction, the main properties of these steady solitonic solutions Φ_n match with those of single particle eigenstates of Eq.(1), including the para-gravitational and anti-gravitational effects and the gravitational redshift effect (see Supplementary). According to the equivalence principle, we can also answer the question on the motion of BEC raised in the introduction: the center of mass of the solitonic BEC ($n \geq 1$) will move upwards and the soliton will move downwards when the acceleration of the elevator is slowly increased from zero.

Expansion of quantum worlds

In cosmology, antigravity could be a consequence of negative-mass solutions in general relativity [33, 34]. On the other hand, antigravity was introduced to explain the incredible astronomical observations. The observed accelerating expansion of the universe [35–40] that contradicts the slowing effects due to the attractive gravitation between matters, seems to result from antigravity. In modern cosmology, the cosmology constant which describes dark energy with negative pressure, is employed to defeat the gravity effects from radiation and matter. The expansion of matter is attributed to its co-movement with the metric expansion of space, which is characterized by a scale factor [41].

In this article, we have discovered a different kind of antigravity, which is a pure quantum effect and generally exists in quantum systems. Remarkably, the responses of quantum matter and classical matter to a common gravitational field are significantly different. So we wonder if quantum matters could move synchronically with classical matters and space during the expansion. In the following, we will reveal an unusual phenomenon in quantum systems: during the expansion of space, the attractive gravitation could accelerate, rather than slow, the expansion of quantum matter due to the antigravity effects.




FIG. 3. a) The expansion factor of the BEC a_M with respect to the scale factor of space a_S , the ratio between the expansion rate of the BEC and that of space \dot{a}_M/\dot{a}_S , and the acceleration of the matter expansion \ddot{a}_M . b) The density profile of the BEC during the expansion of space. The units for λ is \hbar^2/mL .

We consider a quantum world that is full of BEC and make the following assumptions. First, the size of the world is assumed to be finite. In this case, the world can be modeled as an infinite square well. Second, we assume that the space expands over time and the expansion is extremely slow. This means that the width of the well changes all the time, i.e., $L \rightarrow a_S(t)L$, where L is the initial width and the scale factor $a_S(t)$ is time-dependent. Moreover, a slow expansion implies that the adiabatic approximation is still valid for the dynamical evolution of the BEC. Third, for the BEC, there is an effective background central gravitational force field which is jointly contributed by the BEC itself and all other matters. For simplicity, we will naively suppose that the gravitational potential keeps the form $mg|x|$, and neglect the changes of the field strength g during expansion.

To quantify the expansion of the BEC, we introduce its effective radius $R(a_S) \equiv \langle \Phi_n | \text{Abs}[\hat{x}] | \Phi_n \rangle$ and the corresponding expansion factor $a_M = R(a_S)/R(1)$. In Fig. 3a, we plot this expansion factor versus the scale factor of space for the case of steady states with $n = 11$ solitons. We find that in the presence of gravitation, $a_M > a_S$ at the beginning of the expansion of space. However, when a_S becomes sufficiently large, the BEC ceases expansion. In this case, the BEC becomes a bound state of the central gravitational potential and is not influenced by the further increase of the well width. Note that for a larger repulsive interaction strength λ , a weaker gravitational field, or the state with a larger n , the converged value of the expansion factor of the BEC is larger. Meanwhile, we present the ratio of the expansion rates of the BEC and space, \dot{a}_M/\dot{a}_S . For relative small a_S , the figure shows the expansion of quantum matter is faster than that of space. It is worth stressing that the range where $\dot{a}_M/\dot{a}_S > 1$ will be further increased for higher solitonic excitations or when the expansion-induced weakening effect on the gravitational field strength is taken into account. The acceleration of the expansion of the BEC,

\ddot{a}_M , is also plotted in the same figure, where we have assumed that the spatial expansion rate \dot{a}_S is a constant so that $\ddot{a}_M \propto d^2a_M/da_S^2$. The figure shows that the BEC expansion is accelerated ($\ddot{a}_M > 0$) at the beginning. This is indeed the anti-gravitational effect of quantum systems in a usual environment of gravity.

To visualize the expansion process of the BEC, we plot its density distribution for different spatial scale factors $a_S = 0, 4$, and 8 in Fig. 3b. Since the expansion rate of the BEC is larger than that of space at the beginning, the quantum matter is gradually pushed to the outlying district of the well, which becomes evident for $a_S = 4$. For a large scale factor $a_S = 8$, the BEC is fully confined by gravity and becomes a bound state of the gravitational potential (Note that this result may not appear if the gravitational field strength g is strongly weakened during the expansion). From this figure, we also confirm the phenomenon of the gravity-induced redshift.

Conclusion

We have discovered the phenomena of antigravity and anti-inertia in quantum systems. Unlike antigravity in classical systems [33, 34, 41, 42], antigravity in quantum systems is a consequence of quantum-state exclusion which forbids quantum states in finite-size systems to be all para-gravitic or all anti-gravitic. Quantum systems realize antigravity by releasing the kinetic energy of particles, obeying the law of energy conservation. We further show that the expansion of the quantum matter can be accelerated by gravitation. Therefore, quantum matter can expand even faster than the space in the presence of gravitation. Regarding the present progress in the study of the inflation of BEC in topological geometric space to mimic cosmology evolution [43–46], our study provides new and unique observable phenomena in quantum systems. On the other hand, theoretically, the universe underwent spontaneous symmetry breaking and QCD phase transition at the very beginning of the big

bang. As a result, the current universe may be a topological excitation that is full of cosmology domain walls,

cosmology strings, and Skyrmions [47–50]. Our finding indicates that these topological states may also influence the expanding process of the universe.

-
- [1] J. A. Wheeler, *A Journey Into Gravity and Spacetime*, Scientific American Library, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman (1990).
- [2] J. F. Donoghue, Introduction to the effective field theory description of gravity, In Cornet, Fernando (ed.), Singapore: World Scientific (1995).
- [3] J.-L. Staudenmann, S. A. Werner, R. Colella, and A. W. Overhauser, Gravity and inertia in quantum mechanics, *Phys. Rev. A*, **21**, 1419 (1980).
- [4] Y. N. Obukhov, Spin, gravity, and inertia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 192 (2001).
- [5] M. Zych and Č. Brukner, Quantum formulation of the Einstein equivalence principle, *Nature Physics* **14**, 1027 (2018).
- [6] S. Fray, C. A. Diez, T. W. Hänsch, and M. Weitz, Atomic interferometer with amplitude gratings of light and its applications to atom based tests of the equivalence principle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 240404 (2004).
- [7] R. Geiger, V. Ménoret, G. Stern, et al., Detecting inertial effects with airborne matter-wave interferometry, *Nat. Commun.* **2**, 474 (2011).
- [8] E. Okon and C. Callender, Does quantum mechanics clash with the equivalence principle and does it matter, *Euro. Jnl. Phil. Sci.* **1**, 133 (2011).
- [9] T. Van Zoest, N. Gaaloul, Y. Singh, et al., Bose-Einstein condensation in microgravity, *Science* **328**, 1540 (2010).
- [10] D. Becker, M. D. Lachmann, S. T. Seidel, et al., Spaceborne Bose-Einstein condensation for precision interferometry, *Nature* **562**, 391 (2018).
- [11] D. Schlippert, J. Hartwig, H. Albers, L. Richardson, C. Schubert, A. Roura, W. Schleich, W. Ertmer, and E. Rasel, Quantum test of the universality of free fall, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 203002 (2014).
- [12] D. M. Greenberger, The neutron interferometer as a device for illustrating the strange behavior of quantum systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **55**, 875 (1983).
- [13] U. Bonse and T. Wroblewski, Measurement of neutron quantum interference in noninertial frames, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1401 (1983).
- [14] B. Mashhoon, Neutron interferometry in a rotating frame of reference, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2639 (1988).
- [15] V. Xu, M. Jaffe, C. D. Panda, S. L. Kristensen, L. W. Clark, and H. Müller, Probing gravity by holding atoms for 20 seconds, *Science* **366**, 745 (2019).
- [16] M. M. Nieto and T. Goldman, The arguments against “antigravity” and the gravitational acceleration of antimatter, *Physics Reports* **205**, 221 (1991).
- [17] C. Becker, S. Stellmer, P. Soltan-Panahi, S. Dörscher, M. Baumert, E.-M. Richter, J. Kronjäger, K. Bongs and K. Sengstock, Oscillations and interactions of dark and dark-bright solitons in Bose-Einstein condensates, *Nature Phys.* **4**, 496 (2008).
- [18] S. Burger, K. Bongs, S. Dettmer, W. Ertmer, K. Sengstock, A. Sanpera, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and M. Lewenstein, Dark solitons in Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5198 (1999).
- [19] J. Denschlag, J. E. Simsarian, D. L. Feder, et al., Generating solitons by phase engineering of a Bose-Einstein condensate, *Science* **287**, 97 (2000).
- [20] A. R. Fritsch, Mingwu Lu, G. H. Reid, A. M. Piñeiro, and I. B. Spielman, Creating solitons with controllable and near-zero velocity in Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 053629 (2020).
- [21] E. J. Halperin and J. L. Bohn, Quench-produced solitons in a box-trapped Bose-Einstein condensate, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 043256 (2020).
- [22] L. E. Sadler, J. M. Higbie, S. R. Leslie, M. Vengalattore, D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Spontaneous symmetry breaking in a quenched ferromagnetic spinor Bose-Einstein condensate, *Nature* **443**, 312 (2006).
- [23] G. Lamporesi, S. Donadello, S. Serafini, F. Dalfovo, G. Ferrari, Spontaneous creation of Kibble-Zurek solitons in a Bose-Einstein condensate, *Nature Physics* **9**, 656 (2013).
- [24] L. Corman, L. Chomaz, T. Bienaimé, R. Desbuquois, C. Weitenberg, S. Nascimbéne, J. Dalibard, and J. Beugnon, Quench-induced supercurrents in an annular Bose gas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 135302 (2014).
- [25] S. Braun, M. Friesdorf, S. S. Hodgman, M. Schreiber, J. P. Ronzheimer, A. Riera, M. d. Rey, I. Bloch, J. Eisert, and U. Schneider, Emergence of coherence and the dynamics of quantum phase transitions, *PNAS* **112**, 3641 (2015).
- [26] N. Navon, A. L. Gaunt, R. P. Smith, and Z. Hadzibabic, Critical dynamics of spontaneous symmetry breaking in a homogeneous Bose gas, *Science* **347**, 167 (2015).
- [27] L. Chomaz, L. Corman, T. Bienaimé, R. Desbuquois, C. Weitenberg, S. Nascimbéne, J. Beugnon, J. Dalibard, Emergence of coherence via transverse condensation in a uniform quasi-two-dimensional Bose gas, *Nature Commun.* **6**, 6162 (2015).
- [28] M. H. Anderson, J. R. Ensher, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman, and E. A. Cornell, Observation of Bose-Einstein condensation in a dilute atomic vapor, *Science* **269**, 198 (1995).
- [29] K. B. Davis, M.-O. Mewes, M. R. Andrews, N. J. van Druten, D. S. Durfee, D. M. Kurn, and W. Ketterle, Bose-Einstein condensation in a gas of Sodium atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3969 (1995).
- [30] J. Sherson, C. Weitenberg, M. Endres, et al., Single-atom-resolved fluorescence imaging of an atomic Mott insulator, *Nature* **467**, 68 (2010).
- [31] V. I. Balykin, V. G. Minogin, and V. S. Letokhov, Electromagnetic trapping of cold atoms, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **63**, 1429 (2000).
- [32] A. L. Gaunt, T. F. Schmidutz, I. Gotlibovych, R. P. Smith, and Z. Hadzibabic, Bose-Einstein condensation of atoms in a uniform potential, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 200406 (2013).
- [33] H. Bondi, Negative mass in general relativity, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **29**, 423 (1957).
- [34] W. B. Bonnor, Negative mass in general relativity, *Gen.*

- Relat. Gravit.* **21**, 1143 (1989).
- [35] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, M. Valle, et al., Discovery of a supernova explosion at half the age of the Universe, *Nature* **391**, 51 (1998); *Erratum: Nature* **392**, 311 (1998).
- [36] Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, et al., Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high-redshift supernovae, *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999).
- [37] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, et al., Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant, *Astrophys. J.* **116** 1009 (1998).
- [38] P. M. Garnavich, S. Jha, P. Challis, et al., Supernova limits on the cosmic equation of state, *Astrophys. J.* **509**, 74 (1998).
- [39] A. G. Riess, L. M. Macri, S. L. Hoffmann, et al., A 2.4% determination of the local value of the Hubble constant”, *The Astrophysical Journal* **826**, 56 (2016).
- [40] Planck Collaboration, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters”, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*. **641:A6** (2020). *Erratum correction*.
- [41] S. Dodelson, *Modern cosmology* (4 ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press (2008).
- [42] B. Appfel, F. Novkoski, A. Eddi, and E. Fort, Floating under a levitating liquid, *Nature* **585**, 48 (2020).
- [43] R. A. Carollo, D. C. Aveline, B. Rhyno, et al., Observation of ultracold atomic bubbles in orbital microgravity, *Nature* **606**, 281 (2022).
- [44] S. Banik, M. Gutierrez Galan, H. Sosa-Martinez, M. Anderson, S. Eckel, I. B. Spielman, and G. K. Campbell, Accurate determination of Hubble attenuation and amplification in expanding and contracting cold-atom universes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 090401 (2022).
- [45] A. Bhardwaj, D. Vaido, and Daniel E. Sheehy, Inflationary dynamics and particle production in a toroidal Bose-Einstein condensate, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 023322 (2021).
- [46] S. Eckel, A. Kumar, T. Jacobson, I. B. Spielman, and G. K. Campbell, A rapidly expanding Bose-Einstein condensate: an expanding universe in the lab, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021021 (2018).
- [47] T. Skyrme, A unified field theory of mesons and baryons, *Nucl. Phys.* **31**, 556 (1962).
- [48] T. W. B. Kibble, Topology of cosmic domains and strings, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **9**, 1387 (1976).
- [49] T. W. B. Kibble, Some implications of a cosmological phase transition, *Physics Reports* **67**, 183 (1980).
- [50] W. Zurek, Cosmological experiments in superfluid helium, *Nature* **317**, 505 (1985).

Supplementary Materials

1. A poof of the claim that the system in thermal equilibrium is para-gravitic.

In thermal equilibrium, the system’s mass center is,

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_n \langle \phi_n | x | \phi_n \rangle f(\varepsilon_n - \mu), \quad (5)$$

where $f(\varepsilon_n - \mu) = 1/\{\exp[\beta(\varepsilon_n - \mu)] \pm 1\}$ is the Fermi-Dirac or Bose-Einstein distribution. The chemical potential is determined by the total particle number $N_p = \sum_n f(\varepsilon_n - \mu)$. When increasing $g \rightarrow g + \delta g$, using the

perturbation theory, the changed position becomes,

$$\delta \bar{x} = \frac{m \delta g}{N_p} \sum_{n \neq q} \left[\frac{1}{e^{\beta(\varepsilon_n - \mu)} \pm 1} - \frac{1}{e^{\beta(\varepsilon_q - \mu)} \pm 1} \right] \frac{|x_{nq}|^2}{\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_q} - \frac{\beta}{N_p m \delta g} \sum_n \frac{e^{\beta(\varepsilon_n - \mu)} (\delta \varepsilon_n - \delta \mu)^2}{[e^{\beta(\varepsilon_n - \mu)} \pm 1]^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $x_{nq} = \langle \varphi_n | x | \varphi_q \rangle$, $\delta \varepsilon_n = mgx_{nn}$, and $\delta \mu$ is the change of chemical potential. It is not difficult to prove that $\delta \bar{x}$ is always negative for $\delta g > 0$. Thus, the thermal equilibrium system is para-gravitic.

2. The steady n -soliton states in a linear potential

The properties of these steady solitonic excitations qualitatively match with that of excitations in the single particle case. As shown in Fig. 4, the solitonic BECs are anti-gravitic and the solitons (nodes) move downwards when the gravity is present. However, it is worth to mention that the quantum-state exclusion is weakened by the many-body effects (see Fig. 4b): the self-consistent solutions are not necessary to be orthogonal, i.e., $\langle \Phi_m | \Phi_n \rangle \neq 0$ for $m \neq n$, even through the overlap between the many-body wavefunction is arbitrary small (orthogonality), i.e., $|\langle \Phi_m | \Phi_n \rangle|^{N_p} \rightarrow 0$.




FIG. 4. a) The steady n -soliton states and b) the their positions of the center of mass in an infinite square well for $g = 0$ and 20. The interaction strength is $\lambda = 100$.

Acknowledgements

We thank the funding support from the NSFC under grant no. 12105223 and no. 12175180.

Author contributions

All the authors discussed, interpreted the results, conceived the theoretical framework and performed calculation. J.-H. Zheng devised the initial idea. All authors wrote and reviewed the manuscript.

Corresponding author

Jun-Hui Zheng, junhui.zheng@nwu.edu.cn

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.