Lieb M ode in a Quasi One-D im ensional Bose-E instein Condensate of Atoms

A.D. Jackson¹ and G.M. Kavoulakis²

¹Niels Bohr Institute, Blegdam svej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen , Denmark,

²Mathematical Physics, Lund Institute of Technology, P.O. Box 118, S-22100 Lund, Sweden (November 10, 2021)

We calculate the dispersion relation associated with a solitary wave in a quasi-one-dimensional Bose-Einstein condensate of atoms on ned in a harmonic, cylindrical trap in the limit of weak and strong interactions. In both cases, the dispersion relation is linear for long wavelength excitations and term inates at the point where the group velocity vanishes. We also calculate the dispersion relation of sound waves in both limits of weak and strong coupling.

PACS numbers: 05.45 Y, 03.75 Fi, 05.30 Jp, 67.40 Db

Bose-Einstein condensates of trapped alkalimetal atoms [1] o era rich source of interesting non-linear phenomena. At mean-eld level, the e ects of atom-atom interactions can be described as a one-body potential proportional to the local density of atoms. The order parameter, i.e., the condensate wavefunction, then satises a non-linear Schrodinger equation which also includes the e ect of the conning (harmonic) potential.

M any authors have discussed the properties of solitary waves in a Bose-Einstein condensate of trapped alkalim etalatom s [2{9]. Solitary waves were created and studied experim entally by Burger et al. [10] and by Denschlag et al. [11]. Solitary waves result as a balance between the energy cost associated with the Heisenberg principle, $h^2=2m^2$, where m is the atom mass and characteristic length of the solitary wave, and the energy gain due to the local density variation of the system, which is of order nU_0 . Here n is the atom ic density, and $U_0 = 4 \text{ h}^2 \text{ a=m}$ is the e ective two-body interaction m atrix elem ent, with a being the scattering length for atom atom collisions. In the present study, we consider repulsive interactions with a > 0. Equating these two term s, one sees that the characteristic size of a solitary wave is set by the coherence length which satis es the equation $h^2 = 2m^2 = nU_0$. In the experim ents of Refs. [10,11], the e ective interaction between the atom swas repulsive, and the solitary waves were thus density depressions. For an attractive e ective interaction, the solitary waves are expected to be elevations in the density.

Since the atom s are con ned, m om entum is not a good quantum number. However, it is possible to use cigar-shaped traps which are very long along the z axis. These systems are quasi one-dimensional [5,12], and the momentum along this axis is approximately a good quantum number.

An interesting question arises in this context. Some 40 years ago, Lieb considered a purely one-dimensional Bose gas of atoms interacting via a contact potential and predicted two distinct modes of excitation [13]. One was identified as the usual Bogoliubov mode. The other class of excitations was later shown by Kulish et al. [14] to be associated with solitary waves (see also Ref. [15].) These authors demonstrated that the dispersion relation result-

ing from solitary wave excitation is associated to that predicted by Lieb. It is thus reasonable to ask (at least in the case of quasione-dim ensional atom ic condensates) whether this \Lieb mode" exists. Actually, in the recent study of Ref. [16] the Lieb mode was examined in one dim ension. A lthough the theoretical prediction for this m ode seem s m, it has never been observed experim entally. In this regard, it is interesting that Stamper-Kum et al. [17] and 0 zeriet al. [18] have recently m anaged to probe the long wavelength phonon spectrum associated with the Bogoliubov mode in a cigar-shaped condensate of atom s using B ragg spectroscopy. As we argue below, the Lieb mode should be present in such a system and m ay be observable. Since for long-wavelength excitations the Lieb mode coincides with the usual Bogoliubov mode of sound waves, it is crucial that the momentum imparted to the cloud be appropriately large for the two modes to have distinct energies. One, for example, could excite the cloud using the method of phase imprinting, in order to create a solitary wave, and then measure the excitation energy and the corresponding m om entum.

In the present study we derive the dispersion relation associated with the Lieb mode. Reference [19] (and, recently, Ref. [20]) has dealt with the same problem for a di erent range of param eters using a full threedim ensional num erical calculation based on the nonlinear Gross-Pitaevskii equation. In this calculation, the solitary wave is found to be a hybrid between a onedim ensional soliton and a three-dim ensional vortex ring, but the method is applicable in our limit, as well. Since the present results dealwith weaker interactions, we have chosen to adopt a description which neglects the contribution of vortex rings. We distinguish between two \lim its. In the \lim it of weak interactions, n_0U_0 where n_0 is the maximum density of atoms far away from the wave, and !? is the frequency of the trapping potential transversely to the long axis of the trap, the resulting equation is the ordinary nonlinear Gross-Pitaevskii equation. In the opposite limit of strong interactions h!?, the resulting equation is a modi ed G ross-Pitaevskii equation, in which the nonlinear term is proportional to the magnitude of the order parameter. Finally, we calculate the usual Bogoliubov mode in both

regim es of weak and strong interactions and com m ent on the lim its of validity of our study.

M odel. We start with a T = 0 Bose-E instein condensate of atoms con ned in a cylindrical harmonic potential, V = m! $_2^2$ ($x^2 + y^2$)=2 and assume wave motion along the z axis. There is no con nement along the z axis, and away from the wave, there is a uniform density of atoms, n(x;y), which is independent of z. For a short-ranged atom-atom interaction, V_{int} (r $_1^0$) = U_0 (r $_1^0$), the G ross-P itaevskii equation for the order parameter has the form

$$ih Q_{+} = (h^{2}r^{2} = 2m + U_{0} \dot{j} \dot{j}^{2} + V)$$
: (1)

Following Ref. [12], we assume that the transverse dimension of the cloud is su ciently small and the corresponding time scale su ciently rapid that the transverse prole of the particle density can adjust to the equilibrium form appropriate for the instantaneous number of particles per unit length. The problem becomes one-dimensional, and the solitary pulse can be described by a local velocity, v(z), and a local density of particles per unit length, (z) [12], $(z) = dxdy j(x;y;z)j^2$. With this assumption, the wavefunction may be written in the form (r;t) = f(z;t)g(x;y;) [5], where g is the equilibrium wavefunction for the transverse motion which depends on time implicitly through the time except and v(x;y;z) = v(x;y;z). We choose g to be normalized so that v(x;y;z) = v(x;y;z)

. We choose g to be normalized so that $y \hat{j} dx dy = 1$ and thus, from the equations above, $\hat{j} f = 1$.

To proceed, we consider two opposite \lim its, namely the weak-coupling \lim it and the Thomas-Ferm i regime. The transition between the two \lim its occurs for $_0$ a 1=4 [5], where $_0$ is the value of [5] far away from the wave.

W eak-coupling lim it. We rst consider the weak coupling regime. Although this has traditionally been an academ ic lim it, it is now possible to create Bose-E instein condensates in cigar-shaped traps [21] which realize the weak-interaction lim it. In this case juff has a Gaussian form , juff = (a_2^2) 1 e $^{(=a_2)^2}$. As shown in Ref. [5], f satis es the equation

ih
$$\theta_t f = (h^2 = 2m) \theta_z^2 f + h!_? (1 + 2ajf^2) f$$
: (2

We see from this equation that f / $e^{i!}$, $(1+2a_0)t$ as jzj! 1. Thus, we rewrite Eq.(2) using the variable $w=fe^{i!}$, $(1+2a_0)t$ to obtain

$$ih Q_t w = (h^2 = 2m) Q_x^2 w + h!_2 2a (\dot{w}^2) w : (3)$$

Equation (3) has the standard (quadratic) nonlinear term and leads to a speed of sound, c_w , which satis es the equation $m c_w^2 = 2h!_{? 0}$ a [5] [see also Eq.(15).] Since $c_w = c_w = c_w$, we see that $m c_w^2 = c_w = c_w$

 $_0 = n_0$ a_2^2 , we see that $m c_w^2 = n_0 U_0 = 2$. Writing $w = e^i$ and separating the real and in aginary parts of Eq. (3), we obtain the two hydrodynam ic equations

$$\frac{h^2}{2m} = \frac{e^{p} - 2}{e^2} = 2h!_2 \quad a \quad m \, u^2 = \frac{(0)^2}{2}; \quad (4)$$

$$v = u (1 _{0} =):$$
 (5)

Here, we have imposed the boundary condition $v \,! \, 0$ for $! \, 0$. The solution of Eq. (4) is

$$(z) = {}_{0} 1 = \frac{\cos^{2}}{\cosh^{2}(z \cos z)};$$
 (6)

where = $\arcsin(u=q_w)$ and = 2 (n_0) with (n_0) equal to the coherence length for $n_0 = {}_0=(a_2^2)$ (i.e., = $a_2=(2_0a)^{1-2}$). The wavefunction w can also be written as

$$w = P \frac{}{0} [i \sin + \cos \tanh (z \cos =)];$$
 (7)

Energy and momentum of the solitary wave. In the \lim it of weak interactions, Eq. (3) in plies that

$$E = \frac{h^2}{2m} \frac{\theta w}{\theta z} \frac{\theta w}{\theta z} + h!_2 a(ww)^2 + 2h!_2 a_0 ww + h!_2 a_0^2 dz; (8)$$

where the nalterm, which represents the energy of the background density of atoms, ensures convergence of the integral. Equation (8) can be written as

$$E = \frac{z}{2m} \frac{h^{2}}{2m} \frac{e^{p} - z}{e^{z}} + \frac{h^{2}}{2m} \frac{e^{z}}{e^{z}} + h!_{2} a (0)^{2} dz;$$
 (9)

Since $v = h\theta_z = m$, Eqs.(4) and (5) allow us to reduce Eq.(9) to the $\sin p \ln r$ form

$$Z$$
 $E = 2h!_{?} a (0)^{2} dz$: (10)

Given the solitary wave pro le of Eq. (6), Eq. (10) yields

$$E = (4^{9} - 3)E_{0} \cos^{3} ; (11)$$

where $E_0 = h!_{?} (_0a)^{1=2} _0a_{?}$.

Calculation of the momentum P,

$$P = ih \quad w \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} dz = m \qquad (z)v(z) dz; \qquad (12)$$

requires a m ore careful description of the solitary-wave pro le for large jzj. This is most easily accomplished by requiring that the solitonic wavefunction is periodic on a large interval [L=2;+L=2]. The solution to this problem for all L can be expressed analytically in terms of Jacobi elliptic functions [22]. For our purposes, it is su cient to note the behaviour of and in the limit of large L. For z = 0 (L^0), is still given by Eqs. (6) and (7). For positive u, Eq. (5) indicates that θ_z is negative and that a net phase will accumulate as we move from the center of the solitary wave at z = 0 towards z = + L=2. For z = 0 (L), however, the periodic approaches a constant value larger than θ_z 0 by an amount proportional

to 1=L. In this region, θ_z is positive, the total phase accumulated between z=0 and +L=2 is precisely 0, and the periodic boundary conditions are fullled. Evidently, this large-z behaviour makes a nite contribution to the momentum in the L! 1 \lim it which is readily evaluated from Eq. (12). To leading order, the momentum can be evaluated using Eqs. (6) and (7) to obtain

Using the order parameter of Eq. (7), we not that

$$P = P_0 (u=j_1 j 2 \sin 2);$$
 (14)

where $P_0=_0h$. The momentum P was also determined in Ref. [15] using the macroscopic relation $P=_u^1$ (@E=@u) du. This yields a result identical to Eq.(14). Equation (14) implies that a maximum momentum of $P_{max}=_0h$ is obtained for u=0. Note that, to leading order in 1=L, the energy of Eq.(11) is unaltered by the imposition of periodic boundary conditions.

Combining Eqs.(11) and (14), we arrive at the dispersion relation E (P) for the Lieb mode in the limit of weak interactions. The solid line of Fig.1(a) shows this result. For P! 0, E = $c_w P$, in agreement with the usual Bogoliubov dispersion relation discussed below. The Lieb mode term inates at P = P_{max} where it has an energy of $E=E_0=4^{\frac{1}{2}}$ $\overline{2}=3$.

Bogoliubov mode in the weak interaction limit. Equation (3) implies that the Bogoliubov mode obeys the dispersion relation

$$\frac{E}{E_0} = P \frac{P}{2P_0} \frac{P}{P_0} + \frac{P}{P_0} \frac{a_0 a}{8} \frac{a_2}{a} = (15)$$

Choosing $_0a=0:1$, $_a?=1$ m, and $_a=100$ A, the coe cient inside the square root is 125. This number is relatively large because the characteristic wavevector corresponding to P_0 , i.e., $_0$, is much larger than the inverse coherence length, $_0^1$ (n_0). Speci cally, $_0^1$ (n_0) (8 $_0a$) $_0^{1=2}=a_2$. Thus, $_0$ (n_0) a ($_0=a$) $_0^{1=2}$ 10. The dotted line in Fig.1(a) shows the dispersion relation of Eq.(15) for the above numbers.

The strong coupling lim it. In the lim it of strong interactions, n_0U_0 h!, we use the Thom as Ferm iapproxim ation for the transverse pro le, $jgf=2(R_?^2)^1$ (1 $^2=R_?^2$), with $R_?=a_?=2(a)^{1=4}$ [12]. From Ref. [5] we again see that $w=fe^{2i!}$? $^{(0a)t}$ satis es the equation

$$ih \theta_t w = (h^2 = 2m) \theta_z^2 w + 2h!_2 a^{1=2} (jw j jw_0 j) w : (16)$$

The e ective equation obeyed by w now involves a modied non-linear term proportional to jw j. Equation (16) implies a sound speed of m $c_s^2 = h!_? (_0a)^{1=2}$ (see also Eq.(22).] Since $n_0U_0 = 2h!_? (_0a)^{1=2}$, this becomes m $c_s^2 = n_0U_0 = 2$ [5,12].

U sing Eq. (16), we again write $w = {}^{p} - e^{i}$ and separate real and in aginary parts. The velocity is still given by Eq. (5). In addition, Eq. (16) in plies that

$$\frac{h^2}{2m} \frac{e^{p} - 2}{e^{2}} = \frac{2}{3}h!_{?} a^{1=2} (2^{3=2} 3_{0}^{1=2} + 3_{0}^{3=2})$$

$$m u^{2} \frac{(0)^{2}}{2} : (17)$$

This equation provides a relation between u and the minimum value of , $_{\text{min}}$. For a given u, $_{\text{min}}$ is given by the non-trivial root (\in 0) of the right side of Eq.(17).

Energy and momentum in the strong interaction lim it. Using Eq.(13) we not that the momentum is given by

$$P = P_0 = u = c_s$$
 (y $1^2 = y dx$; (18)

where $x = z(0a)^{1-4} = a_2$ and y = 0. Here, is the solution of Eq. (17). In addition, Eq. (16) gives an energy

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} z & \frac{h^2}{2m} & \frac{\theta^p - z}{\theta z} + \frac{h^2}{2m} & \frac{\theta}{\theta z} \end{bmatrix}^2 + \frac{2}{3}h!_2 a^{1-2} + \frac{3}{0} dz : (19)$$

The nalterm in the integral again guarantees its convergence and corresponds to the energy of the background density.

Since $v = h@_z = m$, Eq.(17) and the form ula v = u (1 $_0=$) allow us to write Eq.(19) as

E =
$$(4=3)h!_2 a^{1=2}$$
 (2 3=2 3 $0 + 0 = 0$) dz: (20)

Introducing the unit of energy $E_0^0 = h!_? (a_0)^{1=4} a_0 a_?$

$$E=E_0^0 = \frac{4}{3}^{Z}$$
 (2y³⁼² 3y + 1) dx: (21)

We have solved Eq.(17) num erically to obtain (z) for various values of u. This num erical solution was used in Eqs.(18) and (21) to determ ine P (u) and E (u), respectively. The solid line in F ig.1 (b) shows the resulting dispersion relation for the Lieb mode in the lim it of strong interactions. The x axis is measured in units of P₀, and the y axis is measured in units of E₀. As in the case of weak interactions, the slope of the curve for small values of P is equal to c_s , and also the curve term inates at P_0 with E $1.5\,E_0^3$.

Bogoliubov mode in the \lim it of strong interactions. Equation (16) in plies that the dispersion relation associated with the Bogoliubov mode is

$$\frac{E}{E_0^0} = \frac{Pj}{P_0} + \frac{P}{P_0} + \frac{P}{P_0} + \frac{1}{4} (_0a)^{3=2} + \frac{a_?}{a} = \frac{2}{a}$$
(22)

For $_0a = 1$, $a_? = 1$ m, and a = 100 A, the coe cient inside the square root is 2500, which is 1, since the


characteristic wavevector corresponding to P_0 , i.e., 0, is than 1 (n_0): $_0$ (n_0) $_0$ a_2 = ($_0$ a) $^{1=4}$. The dotted line in Fig.1 (b) shows the dispersion relation of Eq. (22) for this choice of parameters. Once again, the Lieb and the Bogoliubov modes have identical dispersion relations in the lim it of long wavelength excitations, as expected.

The methods adopted here are expected to be reliable for weak interactions [5] for which the width of the solitary wave is much larger than the transverse width of the cloud. In this regime the transverse degrees of freedom are frozen out, and the behavior of the system is essentially one-dimensional. As the strength of the interaction is increased, it has been demonstrated in Ref. [6] that the dark solitary waves become unstable. (See also Ref. [8].) As shown in this reference, dark solitary waves in a cylindrical trap become unstable for $n_0U_0=h!$? 2:4. Assuming that the system is in the Thomas-Fermi regime, $_0=(R_2^2)=n_0=2$, with $R_2^2 = 4a_2^2 (a_0)^{1-2}$ [12], and therefore the corresponding critical value of 0 a is $12^2 = 1.44$. Thus, our approach should also provide a reasonable variational description of the dispersion relation in the strong interaction regim e provided only that dark solitary waves are stable. In addition, we note that the Bogoliubov dispersion relation obtained here is in analytic agreem entwith numerical solutions [23] in the large and small momentum limits for both weak and strong interactions. Di erences of only a few percent for interm ediate m om enta are found for 0a as large as 1.

In sum mary, we have calculated the dispersion relation E = E(P) of a sound wave and of a solitary wave in a quasi one-dimensional Bose-E instein condensate of atoms con ned in a harmonic, cylindrical trap in the limits of weak and strong interactions. For solitary waves, in both limits the spectrum has the same qualitative behaviour: it is linear for long wavelength excitations and coincides with the Bogoliubov mode. For shorter wavelength excitations, it lies below the Bogoliubov mode, and it terminates at a maximum momentum for which the group velocity vanishes.

We would like to thank N. Papanicolaou for pointing out the existence of the Lieb mode to us and for useful discussions. We also acknow ledge pro table discussions with C. J. Pethick. G. M. K. was supported by the Swedish Research Council (VR), and by the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research (SSF). G. M. K. would like to thank the Physics Dept. of the Univ. of Crete for its hospitality.

- [3] T.F.Scott et al., J.Phys.B 31, L329 (1998).
- [4] R.Dum et al, Phys.Rev.Lett.80, 2972 (1998).
- [5] A.D. Jackson et al., Phys. Rev. A 58, 2417 (1998).
- [6] A.E.Muryshev et al., Phys. Rev. A 60, R 2265 (1999).
- [7] T. Busch and J. R. Anglin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2298 (2000).
- [8] D.L.Feder et al, Phys. Rev. A 62, 053606 (2000).
- [9] B.W u et al., e-print cond-m at/0105377.
- [10] S.Burger et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 5198 (1999).
- [11] J.D enschlag et al., Science 287, 97 (2000).
- [12] G.M. Kavoulakis and C.J. Pethick, Phys. Rev. A 58, 1563 (1998).
- [13] E. Lieb, Phys. Rev. 130, 1616 (1963).
- [14] P.P.Kulish et al., Theor. Math. Phys. 28, 615 (1976).
- [15] M. Ishikawa and H. Takayama, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 49, 1242 (1980).
- [16] E.B.Kolom eisky et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 1146 (2000).
- [17] D.M. Stamper-Kum et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 2876 (1999).
- [18] R.O zeri et al., e-print cond-m at/0112496.
- [19] S. Komineas and N. Papanicolaou, e-print condmat/0202182.
- [20] S. Komineas and N. Papanicolaou, e-print condmat/0204136.
- [21] A.Gorlitz et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 130402 (2001).
- [22] T. Tsuzuki, J. Low Temp. Phys. 4, 441 (1971).
- [23] P.O. Fedichev and G.V. Shlyapnikov, Phys. Rev. A 63, 045601 (2001).






FIG. 1. (a) D ispersion relation E=E(P) in the lim it of weak interactions for a solitary wave (solid curve) and for the Bogoliubov mode (dotted line.) The energy is measured in units of E_0 and the momentum in units of P_0 . (b) Same as (a) in the lim it of strong interactions, with the energy measured in units of E_0 . The inset shows the same graph on a smaller scale, for long-wavelength excitations.

^[1] C. J. Pethick and H. Smith, Bose Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2001).

^[2] S.A.Morgan et al, Phys.Rev.A 55, 4338 (1997).