## Magnetism in a lattice of spinor Bose condensates

Kevin Gross, Chris P. Search, Han Pu, Weiping Zhang and Pierre Meystre Optical Sciences Center, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

(D ated: M arch 22, 2024)

W e study the ground state m agnetic properties of ferrom agnetic spinor B ose-E instein condensates con ned in a deep optical lattices. In the M ott insulator regime, the \m ini-condensates" at each lattice site behave as m esoscopic spin m agnets that can interact with neighboring sites through both the static m agnetic dipolar interaction and the light-induced dipolar interaction. We show that such an array of spin m agnets can undergo a ferrom agnetic or anti-ferrom agnetic phase transition under the m agnetic dipolar interaction depending on the dim ension of the con ning optical lattice. The ground-state spin con gurations and related m agnetic properties are investigated in detail.

PACS num bers: PACS num bers: 03.75 Fi, 75.45.+ j, 75.60 E j

#### I. IN TRODUCTION

The interaction between quantum degenerate atom ic gases and optical elds is a cornerstone of modern atom ic physics and quantum optics. In early experiments on Bose-Einstein condensation, light elds were applied primarily for the capture and precooling of atoms, preceding the last stage of evaporative cooling in a magnetic trap. They were also used to obtain dramatic images of the condensates (BEC), and to launch solitons [1] and vortices [2] in condensates. This was soon followed by applications such as the trapping of condensates in optical dipole traps, and the demonstrations of matter-wave superradiance [3, 4] and of coherent matter-wave amplication [5]. More recently, optical dipole traps have been employed for the all-optical realization of BEC and of quantum -degenerate Ferm i gases [6, 7].

O ptical lattices, form ed by counterpropagating laser beam s in one, two and three dimensions, were originally used in polarization gradient cooling and sub-recoil cooling experiments at the single-atom level. They rapidly found further applications in the manipulation of BECs, rst in the demonstration of a \mode-locked" atom laser and the observation of Josephson tunneling between lat-

tice wells [8], and subsequently in the transport and acceleration of condensates [9]. More recently, they have lead to the demonstration of the super uid-Mott insulator transition [10, 11], and of the collapse and revival of the condensate wave function [12]. In the near future, they may also prove useful in the realization of bright atom ic solitons relying on negative elective atom ic m asses in periodic potentials [13].

In contrast to magnetic traps, which only capture atom s in weak- eld seeking states, optical traps function for all hyper ne sublevels of the alkali electronic ground states. This presents considerable advantages, in particular in the study of spinor condensates such as sodium and nubidium. The rst study of the magnetic properties of spinor condensates were carried out by K etterle and cow orkers, who investigated the existence of coexisting spin dom ains in  $^{23}$ N a, an \anti-ferrom agnetic", or \polar" condensate [14].

Recent experim ental and theoretical studies have es-

tablished that in contrast to <sup>23</sup>N a, <sup>87</sup>R b is expected to be ferrom agnetic at zero tem perature. That is, the expectation value of its total spin F is nite, hF i  $\leftarrow$  0 [15, 16, 17]. A s a result, an ensem ble of condensates placed at the potential m inim a of an optical lattice would act as m esoscopic m agnets, m uch like large spins on a crystalline lattice. In the absence of external elds and long range site-to-site interactions, these m agnets would have random orientations.

The situation is changed in the presence of interactions between neighboring lattice sites. It is known that in the case of spins on a crystal lattice, the dom inant source of coupling is the quantum -m echanical exchange interaction. W e recall that 19th century physics failed in its attempts to explain ferrom agnetism in terms of the magnetic dipole-dipole interaction, and it is Heisenberg who rst introduced the exchange force to explain this e ect [18, 19]. In the present case, though, the overlap between neighboring condensate wave functions is negligible for deep enough lattice wells | the Mott insulator state and so is the exchange interaction. Instead, the individual mesoscopic magnets are coupled by the m agnetic (and possibly also the optical) dipole-dipole interaction. Because of the large number N of atoms at each lattice site, this interaction is no longer negligible, despite the large distance, of the order of half an optical wavelength, between sites. As such, the present situation is in some sense a return to 19th century physics. The goal of this paper is to discuss several aspects of the spin and magnetic properties of such lattice systems in oneand two-dim ensions.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II brie y reviews the theory of spinor condensates in general, with special emphasis on the ferrom agnetic and polar ground states resulting from local spinchanging collisions. We then introduce the nonlocal longrange magnetic dipole-dipole interaction between condensates at di erent sites in the optical lattice. Section III brie y reviews previously published results on one-dimensional lattices, and discusses the ferrom agnetic ground state of the full lattice. On this basis, an extension of the one-dimensional case to two-dimensional lattices are analyzed in section IV. The ground state of the system is determined numerically using a genetic algorithm that is discussed in some detail. We show that in that case, the ground state is normally anti-ferrom agnetic. Edge e ects are also brie y addressed. Finally, Section V is a conclusion and outlook.

## II. MODEL

The dynam ics of spinor condensates trapped in optical lattices is prim arily governed by three types of two-body interactions: spin-changing collisions, magnetic dipole-dipole interactions, and light-induced dipole-dipole interactions. For an optical lattice created by blue-detuned laser beam s, the atom s are trapped in the dark- eld nodes of the lattice and the light-induced dipole-dipole interaction can be neglected [20]. In this paper, we focus on this case. As a preparation for sections III, IV and V, we rst discuss the interaction is interactions in som e detail.

## A. Spin-changing collisions

In second-quantized form, the H am iltonian describing a system of spin f = 1 bosons subject to local spinchanging collisions is [21, 22, 23, 24]

$$H = \int_{-\infty}^{X} \frac{Z}{2M} r^{-y}(r) r(r) + U(r)^{-y}(r)$$

$$+ \frac{c_0}{2}^{A} d^{3}r^{y}(r)^{y}(r)(r)(r) (r) (1)$$

$$+ \frac{c_2}{2}^{X} d^{3}r^{y}(r)^{y}(r)F; F; (r)(r);$$

where (r) is the eld annihilation operator for an atom in the hyper ne state jf = 1;  $m_f = i$ , = 1;0;1,U (r) is a potential produced by an optical dipole trap and assum ed to be the same for all hyper ne states, and M is the mass of the atom s. F is the vector operator for the hyper ne spin of an atom, with components represented by 3 3 matrices in the jf = 1;  $m_f = i$  subspace. For ultracold bosons, only s-wave collisions with total hyperne spin of F = 0;2 are allowed, and

$$c_0 = \frac{4 ~^2}{3M} (a_0 + 2a_2);$$

and

$$c_2 = \frac{4 \sim^2}{3M} (a_2 a_0);$$

where  $a_0$  and  $a_2$  are the s-wave scattering lengths for collisions in the F = 0 and F = 2 channel, respectively.

The ground state properties of spinor condensates subject to these local spin-changing collisions have been determ ined by introducing the components  $_{a}$  (r) of the

spinor condensate wave function in the mean-eld approximation,

$$(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{h} \quad (\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} = \frac{\mathbf{p}}{\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{r})} \quad (\mathbf{r});$$
 (2)

where n (r) is the local atom ic density and (r) a normalized spinor, and m inim izing the energy functional

$$E = \begin{cases} Z \\ d^{3}r \frac{z^{2}}{2M} \\ d^{3}r \\ d^{3}$$

In this expression, is the chemical potential and the averaged single-atom spin angular momentum is

$$hF(r)i = {}^{?}(r)F; (r):$$
 (3)

For  $c_2 > 0$ , the energy E is minimized by hF (r)i = 0, and the spinor condensate is in an \anti-ferrom agnetic", or \polar" state. This is the case for <sup>23</sup>N a condensates, in which case  $a_2 = a_0$  ' 5 a.u. K etterle and cow orkers have studied this situation in great detail [14]. In particular they have obtained spin-dom ain diagram s and studied experimentally the miscibility of these domains in the presence of external edds.

For  $c_2 < 0$ , in contrast, the energy E is minimized by making hF (r) $i^2 = 1$ . As discussed in Ref. [22], the direction of the spin is

$$hF(r)i = \cos_{0}2 + \sin_{0} (\cos_{0}x + \sin_{0}y); \quad (4)$$

where  $_0$  and  $_0$  are Euler angles. All possible orientations ( $_0$ ;  $_0$ ) are possible and lead to the same ground-state energy E. Recent theoretical calculations by K lausen et al. predict that for spin-1  $^{87}$ Rb, the scattering lengths  $a_0$  and  $a_2$  are alm ost equal, but with  $a_0 > a_2$ , with a di erence of the order of 0.3 to 2.7 a.u. [16].

Consider, then, an <sup>87</sup>Rb condensate trapped on an optical lattice with wells deep enough that its ground state is the M ott-insulator state, i.e., there is no global phase of the condensate over m any lattice sites [11]. Each lattice site is therefore the location of a \m ini-condensate," which can contain as many as several thousands atom s in one-dimensional lattices, and several hundreds in 2-D lattices. In the absence of external elds and longrange site-to-site interactions, these condensates can be thought of as independent m agnets, whose spin vectors point in random directions, with no spin correlations between sites. This situation is similar to the spin lattices fam iliar from the study of magnetism, with two di erences. First, the quantum mechanical exchange interaction, which is at the core of magnetism, is completely neqligible in the present situation. This is because neighboring sites on an optical lattice are at least one half optical wavelength apart. For deep lattice wells, the center-ofm ass wave functions for the individual m ini-condensate

 $\mid$  essentially the ground state W annierwave functions at the individual sites  $\mid$  do not have any signi cant overlap. Second, the magnetic dipolar coupling, which is normally negligible and leads to the prediction of C urie tem peratures several orders of magnitude low erthan actually observed in solid state magnetic materials, is now the dom - inant interaction, due to the large number N of atoms at each lattice site. This leads to an N  $^2$  enhancement factor, as we now show .

## B. M agnetic dipole-dipole interaction

In order to describe the magnetic dipolar interaction between mini-condensates at lattice sites i and j, we assume that the condensates at each site can be treated independently, and have the same spatial form, which is also independent of the spin state of the atom s. Specically, we decompose the Schrödinger eld operator as

(r) = 
$$(r) jf = 1; m_f = i;$$
  
= 0; 1

with

$$_{a}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i}^{X} (\mathbf{r}) \hat{a} (i) :$$
 (5)

In this expansion, which goes beyond the mean-eld approximation of Eq. (2),  $r_i$  is the coordinate of the i-th lattice site,  $\hat{a}$  (i) and  $\hat{a}^{y}$  (i) are bosonic annihilation and creation operators for atom s in the hyper ne state at site i, and  $_{i}(r) = (r - r_{i})$  is the ground state wave function of the mini-condensate at that site, normalized to unity. For  $a_0$  '  $a_2$ , it is approximately given by the solution of the stationary G ross-P itaevskii equation

$$\frac{-2r^{2}r^{2}}{2M} + U_{i}(r) + c_{0} (N_{i} \quad 1)j_{i}(r)f^{2} \qquad i(r) = 0;$$

where

is the total num ber of atom s at site i and we assume that all sites have the same num ber of atom s.

The magnetic dipole-dipole interaction between the mini-condensates at sites i and j is given by [25]

$$V_{dd}^{ij} = \frac{0}{4} d^{3}r d^{3}r^{0}j(r r_{1})f^{j}j(r^{0} r_{j})f^{j}$$
$$\frac{\gamma_{i}}{jr r_{j}} \frac{3(\gamma_{i} (r_{1}^{0})r_{j})(\gamma_{j} (r_{1}^{0})r_{j})}{jr r_{j}};$$

where  $_0$  is the vacuum permeability and  $\sim_i$  is the magnetic dipole moment at site i. In second-quantized form , it is given explicitly by

$$x_i = B^X \hat{a}^Y (i)F; \hat{a} (i) B^S_i;$$

where  $_{B} = g_{F} _{B}$  is the gyrom agnetic ratio and we recognize that  $S_{i}$  is the angularm on entum operator for the condensate at site i. We rem ark that for a given site, the expectation value of  $\sim_{i}$  is

$$h_{i}i = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ B \end{bmatrix} h_{a}y (i)F ; a (i)i$$
  
;  
' N<sub>i B</sub> hF<sub>i</sub>i;

where  $hF_{i}$  is the single-atom magnetization at the site, see Eq. (3).

Sum marizing, then, the Ham iltonian describing the spinor \m ini-condensates" in the optical lattice, subject to spin-changing collisions and to an inter-site magnetic dipolar interaction has the spin-spin coupling form

where

and the tensor ij is defined by

7

$$_{ij} = \frac{B 0}{4} \frac{Z}{d^{3}r} \frac{Z}{d^{3}r^{0}} \frac{j(r r_{i})f_{j}(r^{0} r_{j})f(r r^{0})}{r}$$

W e have also introduced an external magnetic eld B  $_{\rm ext}$  for future use. In the lim it of tight con nem ent, the condensate wave functions at each lattice site can be approxim ated by

In this lim it we have

$$_{ij} = \frac{B \ 0}{4 \ jr_{ij}j};$$

and the tensor in becomes

$$_{ij} = _{ij} \hat{r}_{ij}^{2};$$

where  $r_{ij} = r_i$   $r_j$  and  $\hat{r}_{ij} = r_{ij} = \hat{r}_{ij}$ 

## III. FERROMAGNETISM IN A 1D OPTICAL LATTICE

In this section, we study the magnetic properties and spin dynamics of spinor condensates in a 1D optical lattice. More speci cally, we consider a blue-detuned optical lattice where the mini-condensates are trapped at the standing wave nodes. In this case, the light-induced dipolar interaction can be ignored and the m ini-condensates only interact via the m agnetic dipolar interaction. W ithout loss of generality, we assume that the axis of the lattice is along the z direction, which we also choose as the quantization axis. Hence the total Ham iltonian (6) reduces to

W e assume that the magnetic eld B  $_{\rm ext}$  is of the form

$$B_{ext} = B_z \hat{z} + B_x \hat{x};$$

where  $B_z \hat{z}$  is an applied eld and  $B_x \hat{x}$  is an elective magnetic eld that accounts for all possible elects from the experimental environment. While this eld can have any possible orientation, we take it to be transverse and along  $\hat{x}$  without loss of generality, since any longitudinal component can be included in  $B_z$ .

Furtherm ore, we consider an in nitely long lattice so that boundary e ects can be ignored. The ham iltonian describing the spin S of a generic site i reads then

$$h = {}^{0}_{a}S^{2} {}_{B}S {}^{4}@ {}_{B}{}_{z} + {}^{X}{}_{ij}S^{z}_{j}A 2$$

$$0 {}^{jei} {}^{3}$$

$$+ {}^{0}_{B}S {}^{x}_{j}S^{x}_{j}A 2 {}^{ijS}_{j}S^{y}_{j}S^{5}: (8)$$

$${}^{jei}{}^{jei} {}^{jei}$$

We now proceed to determ ine the ground state of the single-site H am iltonian (8) in the mean-eld | or W eiss molecular eld | approximation [19]. It consists in replacing the operators  $S_j$ , = x;y;z, by their ground-state expectation value

$$hS_{i}i! M = Nm; \qquad (9)$$

which is assumed to be the same for all sites. We remark that  $m_z$  is nothing but the di erence in population of the Zeem an sublevels of magnetic quantum numbers

1. Replacing S<sub>i</sub> by N m allow sus to approximate the

Hamiltonian (8) by

$$h_{mf} = {}^{0}_{a}S^{2} \qquad {}_{B}S \qquad \textcircled{B}; \qquad (10)$$

where we have introduced the elective magnetic eld

$$B_{e} = (B_{z} + 2 m_{z})2 + (B_{x} m_{x})3 m_{y}2;$$

and

In the case of  $^{87}\mathrm{R}\,b$ , the individual spinor condensates at the lattice sites are ferrom agnetic,  $^0_a$  < 0. In that case, the ground state of the m ean- eld H am iltonian (10) m ust correspond to a situation where the condensate at the site i under consideration m ust be aligned along B $_e$  and takes its m axim um possible value N . That is, the ground state of the m ean- eld H am iltonian (10) is simply

$$j_{GSi} = j_{N}; N i_{B_{eff}};$$
 (11)

where the rst number denotes the total angularm on entum and the second its component along the direction of  $B_{\rm e}$ . Note that  $j \mbox{GSi}$  represents a spin coherent state in the basis of  $\beta; S_z i$ . The fact that the ground state magnetic dipole moment of each lattice site is N times that of an individual atom results in a signi cant magnetic dipole-dipole interaction even for lattice points separated by hundreds of nanom eters. This feature, which can be interpreted as a signature of Bose enhancement, is in stark contrast with usual ferrom agnetism, where the magnetic interaction is negligible compared to exchange and where the use of ferm ions is essential.

The mean-eld ground state of Eq. (11) allows us to calculate the magnetization  $m_{x,y,z}$ . One nds readily

$$m = \frac{1}{N} hG S \beta_i \beta_i \beta S i = \infty ;$$

where is the angle between  $B_e$  and the -axis. In the absence of externally applied eld,  $B_z = 0$ , this gives

$$m_z = \frac{2 m_z}{B}; \qquad (12a)$$

$$m_{x} = \frac{B_{x} m_{x}}{B}; \qquad (12b)$$

$$m_y = \frac{m_y}{B}$$
(12c)

where  $B = \frac{p}{(2 m_z)^2 + (B_x m_x)^2 + (m_y)^2}$  normalizes the magnetization vector to unity.

Since B > 0, the third of these equations in plies that  $m_y = 0$ . W ith  $m_x^2 + m_z^2 = 1$  and the condition 2 = B, which follows directly from the equation form  $_z$ , we and further that for  $B_x = 3$ , the unique solution is  $m_z = m_y = 0$ ,  $m_x = 1$ . That is, the lattice of condensates is magnetically polarized along the environmental magnetic eld  $B_x$ . For  $B_x < 3$ , in contrast, there are two coexisting sets of solutions: i)  $m_z = m_y = 0$  and  $m_x = 1$ ; and ii)  $m_z = \frac{P}{1} \frac{(B_x=3)^2}{(B_x=3)^2}$ ,  $m_y = 0$  and  $m_x = B_x=3$ . It is easily seen that the state associated with the latter solutions has the lower energy. Hence it corresponds to the true ground state, while solution 1 represents an unstable equilibrium.

W e have, then, the follow ing situation: A s the e ective magnetic eld strength B<sub>x</sub> is reduced below the critical value 3, the lattice ceases to be polarized along the direction of that eld. A phase transition occurs, and a spontaneous magnetization along the z-direction appears, characterized by a nite m<sub>z</sub>. This phenom enon

is rem iniscent of conventional ferror agnetism. Indeed, our m odel is analogous to the Ising m odel[18], with the environm ental transverse m agnetic eld  $B_x$  playing the role oftem perature. For  $B_x = 0$  | corresponding to zero tem perature in Ising m odel | the spins at each lattice site  $S_i$  align them selves along the lattice direction, even in the absence of longitudinal eld. This spontaneous spin m agnetization dim in shes as  $B_x$  increases, and com – pletely vanishes if  $B_x$  exceeds the critical value 3 | the analog of the C urie tem perature in the Ising m odel. We note how ever that the situation at hand exhibits in portant qualitative di erences with the Ising m odel. For example, no spontaneous m agnetization occurs in 1D Ising m odel, for any nite tem perature.

W e note how ever that the appearance of a spontaneous m agnetization does not rely on this condition being fullled. This point was discussed in Ref.[27], which nu-

m erically solved the H am iltonian (7) without invoking the m ean-eld approximation for a two-well system and showed how the situation rapidly approaches the m eaneld results as N increases.

# IV. ANTIFERROM AGNETIC GROUND STATE OF THE 2D LATTICE

Now we turn our attention to 2D lattices, formed as before by blue-detuned lasers. We show that depending on the relative magnitude of the lattice constants along its two axes, this system exhibits a variety of possible ground states, including an anti-ferrom agnetic con guration.

We consider a rectangular lattice in the (y;z)-plane, with primitive lattice vectors  $a = a\hat{z}$  and  $b = b\hat{y}$ , of lengths a and b, in these two directions. We assume as before that the number of atoms at each lattice site is the same and that the atom s are tightly con ned so that we can approxim ate their probability density by a delta function at each lattice site,

$$j_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) \dot{f} = (\mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}_{j})$$
:

H ere,  $r_{ij} = ia + jb$  is the position of the center of the (i; j) lattice site. U nder these conditions, the H am iltonian (6) with  $B_{ext} = 0$  becomes

$$H = \int_{ij}^{2} \frac{4}{2} S_{ij}^{2} + \frac{B}{4} \int_{klicij}^{0} X S_{ij}^{T} = \int_{klicij}^{0} \frac{3}{4} S_{ij}^{T} S_{ij}^{T} S_{ij}^{T} S_{ij}^{T} S_{ij}^{T} S_{ij}^{T} = \int_{klicij}^{0} \frac{3}{4} S_{ij}^{T} S_{ij$$

where

$${}_{ij;kl} = \begin{cases} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ B & 0 & \frac{1}{jr_{ij;kl}j^3} & \frac{3(na)^2}{jr_{ij;kl}j^5} & \frac{3(na)(mb)}{jr_{ij;kl}j^5} & \sum_{rij;kl} \frac{3(na)(mb)}{jr_{ij;kl}j^5} & \sum_{rij;kl} \frac{3(mb)^2}{jr_{ij;kl}j^5} & \frac{1}{jr_{ij;kl}j^5} & \frac{3(mb)^2}{jr_{ij;kl}j^5} & (14) \end{cases}$$

and  $r_{ij;kl} = r_{ij}$   $r_{kl} = na + mb, w \text{ ith } n = i$  k and m = j l.

## A. in nite size lattices

As in the preceding section, we determ ine the ground state of the lattice in the sem iclassical lim it, ignoring spin-spin correlations and replacing the operators  $S_{ij}$  with their expectation value with respect to a spin coherent state,

The sem iclassical ground state corresponds to the orientation of the spin vectors that m in im izes the sem iclassical energy corresponding to the Ham iltonian (13). In contrast to the one-dimensional case, it is not obvious from inspection of Eq. (13) that all expectation values M  $_{ij}$ should be equal. Hence, the determ ination of the ground state for an N M lattice requires the minimalization of the energy with respect to 2N M variables. However, in the lim it of an in nite lattice the ground state should be translationally invariant with respect to displacem ents of the spins by a nite num ber of lattice constants along either axis. We can therefore generalize the mean-eld ansatz used in the one-dim ensional case by assuming that the 2D lattice can be decomposed into a nite set f'g of interpenetrating periodic sublattices for which all spin vectors have the sam e orientation.

The positions of the sites of the sublattice 'of primitive lattice vectors  $a_{\nu}$  and  $b_{\nu}$  are

$$\mathbf{r}_{ij} = \mathbf{i}\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{a}_{i0} + \mathbf{j}\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i0}$$

where  $a_{i,0}$  and  $b_{i,0}$  denote the origin of that lattice. Since the interaction between dipole moments that are perpendicular to the plane of the lattice is repulsive while the interaction between dipole moments in the plane of the lattice is predom inantly attractive, the ground statem ust correspond to spin vectors in the plane (y;z) of the lattice. Hence the spin vector associated with the sublattice ' can be written as

$$M = N (\cos \sqrt{2} + \sin \sqrt{2})$$
:

One can gain an intuitive feel for the ground state of the system by considering what happens when one lets a 1D lattice approach an already existing one from in nity. For concreteness, we take the axes of both lattices to be along 2. We know from the previous section that for large lattice separations, the spins in each lattice will be oriented in either the + 2 or 2 direction with equal probability. In e ect, each lattice acts like a long barm agnet. As the lattices approach each other, though, they start to interact via their magnetic dipole moments. The minim ization of energy then proceeds in a fam iliar way: Just as two barm agnets placed side by side orient them selves so that opposite poles are next to each other, the spins of the two 1D lattices will arrange their orientation so that the spins in one lattice point along +2 while in the other lattice the spins point along 2. This will remain true as long as the lattice separation is much larger than

the primitive lattice vector b of the 1D lattices, due to the  $1=r^3$  dependence of the magnetic dipole interaction. Indeed, in this case the easy axis is the y-axis.

This argument can easily be generalized to many rows. It follows that for a b, rows of spins parallel to the z-axis will alternatively align them selves along the +2 and

2 direction. Similarly, for a b, the z-axis becomes the easy axis and rows of spins parallel to y align them – selves alternatively along the +2 or 2 direction. In both cases, though, the ground state is expected to be anti-ferrom agnetic.

Even though the magnetic dipole interaction is long ranged, it is easy to see that neighboring spins within each row interact more strongly than do neighboring spins in adjacent rows provided that a = b + bwith positive. One therefore expects that the ground state will remain anti-ferrom agnetic unless ! 0. In this lim it, there are clearly two degenerate anti-ferrom agnetic ground states that are topologically distinct, i.e. that can not be related by a simple rotation. Any weighted com bination of these two con gurations has the same energy and is therefore a new degenerate ground state. A ssigning the weight  $\cos^2$  to the ground state with all spins pointing in the  $\circ$  direction and sin<sup>2</sup> to the ground state with all spins in the 2, then we nd that this situation is equivalent to a ground state consisting of four interpenetrating sublattices ('= 1;2;3;4), with spin orientations,

$$M_1 = N (\cos \hat{y} + \sin \hat{z}); \qquad (15a)$$

$$M_2 = N (\cos \hat{y} + \sin \hat{z});$$
 (15b)

$$M_{3} = N (\cos \hat{y} \sin \hat{z}); \qquad (15c)$$

$$M_4 = N (\cos \hat{y} \sin \hat{z}); \qquad (15d)$$

and sublattice sites located at

$$r_{1;ij} = 2ia + 2jb;$$
 (16a)

$$r_{2;ij} = 2ia + (2j + 1)b;$$
 (16b)

$$r_{3;ij} = (2i+1)a + (2j+1)b;$$
 (16c)

$$r_{4;ij} = (2i+1)a + 2jb;$$
 (16d)

where i; j = 0; 1; 2; .... The corresponding lattice structure is illustrated in Fig. 1. For a = b all values of are degenerate while for a < b and a > b the ground state corresponds to equal to 0 and = =2, respectively.

The next section discusses the use of a genetic algorithm to numerically determ ine of the lattice ground state for a nite lattice size.

## B. Finite size lattices

## 1. Genetic algorithm

Genetic algorithms have become a widely used tool for solving optim ization problem s that depend on a large



FIG .1: O rientations of the spins on the four interpenetrating sublattices for  $a=\,b.$  The lengths are in units of % f(x)=0 .

num ber of variables [28]. The basic idea behind genetic algorithm s is D arw inian natural selection. These algorithms proceed from an initial set of trial solutions to the optim ization problem, which can be thought of as individuals in a population. The individuals breed, follow – ing some prescribed mating rules, to produce o spring, which constitute the next generation of individuals. In addition, random mutations are also introduced. The o spring that produce better solutions to the problem survive and are allowed to further breed, while those that produce poor solutions are elim inated. Ideally, after m any generations the algorithm converges to the optim al solution (s) to the problem at hand.

In the specic system at hand, the algorithm starts from a large population N of initial lattices, typically N = 512. Most of them have completely random spin orientations, but some may have ordered con gurations based on the ground state of the in nite lattice. At each generation, the genetic algorithm perform sa combination of mutations and breeding steps on the members of the population, which we refer to as mutating and mating.

The mutations modify each member of the population to form a second population of N lattices. They can be either global and local. Local mutations involve giving random rotations to a random percentage of the spins in the individual lattices. These rotations are by angles ' and about the y and x axes, respectively, where ' and are norm ally distributed random numbers with standard deviations typically chosen to be =8. In contrast, the global mutations rotate all spin in the lattice by related amounts: They either apply the same random rotation to all lattice sites, or rotate the spin at each lattice site by a slightly di erent amount determ ined by its value (this is used when investigating the case of equal lattice constants, a = b, discussed below). In general, a given individual is subjected to both local and global mutations.

A fler the mutations are performed, the 2N individuals are allowed to mate. The mating process random ly picks two individuals using a norm ally distributed probability distribution centered around individuals with the lowest energy. This insures that, on average, only those individuals with the lowest energies produce o spring. Each pair of parents produces two o springs using one of four random ly selected m ating techniques: site swapping, sub-lattice swapping, row and column swapping, and row and column rearranging. Site swapping consists of swapping a random number of random ly chosen sites from the parents. Sim ilarly, sub-lattice sw apping consists of swapping a random ly sized and positioned sub-lattice between the parents. Row and column swapping works by random ly picking rows from both parents and form ing one child, and doing the same with columns to form a second child. Row and column rearranging uses only a single parent to produce a child by random ly rearranging its rows or columns. The mating process is repeated N times at each generation to produce a total population of 4N lattices. Of those, only the N individuals with the low est energy are selected as parents for the next generation.

The genetic algorithm is run until the relative energies of the individuals in generation M and M 100 di er by less than 10<sup>7</sup>.

## 2. Num erical results

The ground state of the system determ ined by the genetic algorithm is characterized by all spins lying in the plane of the lattice, in agreement with the discussion of section IV. If the lengths of the primitive lattice vectors a and b dier signicantly, say, by 10 percent or more, the ground state is anti-ferrom agnetic. With the exception of sites near the lattice boundary, the anti-ferrom agnetic structure is identical to that predicted based on an in nite lattice.

As is to be expected, boundary e ects become more important, the smaller the lattice. In that case, the ground state is characterized by spins orientations near the boundaries that deviate from the  $\circ$  or 2 directions. When a and b are signi cantly di erent, these boundary e ects are manifest only near the corners of the lattice, and they lower the ground state energy by a very small amount. For example, for a = 0.6 and b = 0.5, where is the wavelength of the laser form ing the lattice in the z-direction, the boundary e ects reduce the ground-state energy of an 11 11 lattice by only 0.1 percent com pared to its in nite lattice value. For larger lattices, the boundary e ects becom e even smaller.

W hen a = b, nite size e ects are more important in determining the spin structure of the ground state. We recall that in that case, an in nite lattice possesses an in nite number of degenerate ground states characterized by the angle . Boundary e ects break this degeneracy and lead to the appearance of a preferred pattern. Fig.2 illustrates the transition from the boundary dom inated pattern of the a = b situation to the anti-ferrom agnetic



FIG.2: The ground state con guration shows the transition from the boundary dom inated pattern for a = b to the antiferrom agnetic con guration for  $a \notin b$ . From top to bottom, b = 0.5, 0.505 and 0.6, respectively and a = 0.5 for all gures. The lengths are in units of .

con guration of a f b. As illustrated in Fig. 2a, for the case of a = b, near boundaries the spins are aligned parallel to them . That this should be the case is plausible since when going from a situation where a < b to a > b, the spin orientation must go from being parallel to the yaxis to being parallel to the z-axis. To accom m odate the orthogonal directions along two adjacent boundaries, the angle near the corners changes in such a way that the spins at the corner sites make an angle of =4 relative to the y- and z-axis. This lifts the degeneracy present in the in nite lattice. As a result, the spins near the center of the nite lattice always take on an orientation corresponding to Eqs. (15) and (16) with = =4. This result holds for all nite-size lattices. Finally, we note that the ground-states of nite-size lattices are two-fold degenerate, the second ground state being obtained by re ections about the y and z axes.

Figure 3 shows how the spins orients them selves as b



FIG.3: Plot of the deviation angle relative to the y axis for the spin at the center of the lattice (solid curve) and a spin on left boundary of the lattice (dashed curve) as functions of b for xed a = 0.5. Lengths are in units of .

changes for xed a. As b deviates from a, the spins near the center of the lattice quickly become parallel to the easy-axis, while the spins near the boundaries become so much more slow ly.

#### V. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

In summary, we have studied the spin con gurations and magnetic properties of spinor Bose-E instein condensates in an optical lattice. In the tight-binding limit, the ground state is the M ott-insulator state and the condensed atoms at each lattice site collectively behave as a spin magnet. Due to Bose enhancement, the dipoledipole interactions between these spin magnets become im portant and m ay give rise to a rich variety of phenom ena. W e have shown here that the array of spin m agnets can undergo a ferrom agnetic (in the 1D case) or antiferrom agnetic (in the 2D case) phase transition under the dipolar interaction when external magnetic elds are su ciently weak. Using the same mechanism, it will also be possible to create ferrin agnetic lattice system s if one can interleave two sets of optical dipole potentials, each trapping one species of atom s (or one hyper ne state of the same atom ) di erent from the other.

In the case of a far red-detuned lattice such that the spacing between adjacent lattice site exceeds the atom ic resonant wavelength, the detection of the ground state spin structure amounts to detecting populations in the individual Zeem an sublevels at each site. This can be achieved using a R am an scattering scheme. For example, one can shine two light beam s, one -polarized and the other circularly polarized, onto the system . The absorption or gain of the probing light after passing the sam ple

is then a measure of the relative population of the hyper ne levels, since it depends upon which of them are initially populated. This scheme wouldn't work for a blue detuned lattice, though, since in that case the spacing between neighboring sites is sub-wavelength. However, the long range periodic spin structure, in particular the ferrom agnetic and anti-ferrom agnetic ordering, can still be detected by B ragg scattering [29]. Let us take <sup>87</sup>Rb as an example. Its ground state is the  $5S_{1=2}$  state with F = 1. For + -polarized B ragg probe light (we choose the quantization axis to be parallelor antiparallel to atom ic spins) with a frequency close to the F = 1 !  $F^{0} = 2 D 2 reso$ nance line, then the ratio of the transition strength (or scattering cross section) for atom s in m =1 and m = 1Zeem an sublevel is 1=6. As a result, the Bragg signal depends on whether one has a ferrom agnetic lattice (where all the atom same in eitherm = 1 orm = 1 Zeem an sublevel) or anti-ferrom agnetic lattice (where half the atom s 1 and the other half are in m = 1 sublevel). are in m =

In addition to their ground state structure, spinor condensates in an optical lattices also possesses considerable potential for studying other phenom ena such as spin waves [30], macroscopic magnetization tunneling [31], dom ain wall form ation, etc. Future studies will also include the dynam ical properties of the system . Due to the longrange as well as the nonlinear nature of the dipolar interaction, the dynam ics of the system should be very rich. For instance, given a ground state 2D lattice with prim itive lattice constants a < b where all the spins are aligned along the 🕏 direction, one can suddenly modify the lattice light so that a > b. W hether and how the spins adjust them selves to the new ground state will be an interesting problem, closely related to the phenom enon of spin tunneling [31]. In addition, these system s m ay also nd applications in the eld of quantum information and computation. We conclude by noting that in addition to the Mott insulator limit studied in this paper, the genetic algorithm that we have developed here might be modi ed to investigate the other lim it where tunneling between lattice sites becomes signi cant and the system becom es a super uid [32].

## A cknow ledgm ents

W e thank Prof. Poul Jessen for helpful discussion and S. Potting for help with the gures. This work is supported in part by the USO ce of NavalResearch under Contract No. 14-91-J1205, by the National Science Foundation under G rants No. PHY 00-98129, by the USA my Research O ce, by NASA Grant No. NAG 8-1775, and by the Joint Services Optics Program.

- [1] S. Burger et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 5198 (1999); J. Denschlag et al, Science 287, 97 (2000).
- [2] M.R.Matthewsetal, Phys.Rev.Lett.83, 2498 (1999).

- [3] S. Inouye et al., Science 285, 571 (1999);
- [4] M.G.Moore and P.Meystre, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 5202 (1999).
- [5] S. Inouye et al., Nature (London) 402, 641 (1999); M. Kozum a et al., Science 286, 2309 (1999).
- [6] M.D.Barrett, J.A.Sauer and M.S.Chapman, Phys. Rev.Lett. 87, 010404 (2001).
- [7] S.R.Granade, M.E.Gehm, K.M.O'Hara and J.E. Thom as, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 120405 (20002).
- [8] B.P.Anderson and M.A.Kasevich, Science 281, 1686 (1998).
- [9] O. Morsch et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 140402 (2001); S. Potting et al., Phys. Rev. A 64, 023604 (2001).
- [10] M.Greiner et al, Nature (London) 415, 39 (2002).
- [11] D.Jaksch et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3108 (1998).
- [12] M.Greiner, O.M andel, T.Hansch and I.Bloch, private communication.
- [13] O.Zobay, S.Potting, P.M eystre and E.M.W right, Phys. Rev.A, 643 (1999); S.Potting, O.Zobay, P.M eystre and E.M.W right, J.M od. Optics 47, 2653 (2000).
- [14] J. Stenger et al, Nature (London) 396, 345 (1998).
- [15] J.P.Burke, Jr. and J.L.Bohn, Phys. Rev. A 59, 1303 (1999).
- [16] N.N.K lausen, J.L.Bohn and C.H.G reene, Phys. Rev. A 64, 053602 (2001).
- [17] E.G.M. van Kempen, S.J.J.M.F.Kokkelmans, D.J. Heinzen and B.J.Verhaar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 093201 (2002).
- [18] Kerson Huang, Statistical Mechanics (John W iley & Sons, New York, 1987).
- [19] N.W. A shcroft and N.D.Merm in, Solid State Physics (Harcourt Brace College Publishers, New York, 1976).

- [20] For a red-detuned lattice, the atom s are trapped in the antinodes of lattice laser beam s and for appropriate laser param eters, the light-induced dipole-dipole interaction can have an important e ect on spin dynam ics as studied in R ef.[30].
- [21] W .Zhang and D .F .W alls, Phys. Rev. A 57, 1248 (1998).
- [22] T.-L.Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 742 (1998).
- [23] T. Ohm i and K. Machida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 67, 1882 (1998).
- [24] C.K.Law, H.Pu and N.P.Bigelow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5257 (1998).
- [25] The e ect of the dipolar interaction on a condensate trapped in a single well has been considered by several groups. See, for exam ple, K.G oral et al., Phys. Rev. A 61, 051601 (2000); L.Santos et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 1791 (2000); S.Yiand L.You, Phys. Rev. A 63, 053607 (2001).
- [26] D.R.M eacher et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, 1958 (1995).
- [27] H.Pu, W. Zhang and P.M eystre, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 140405 (2001).
- [28] D avid Coley, An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms for Scientists and Engineers (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1999).
- [29] G. Binkl et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2823 (1995); M. Weidem uller et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 4583 (1995).
- [30] W .Zhang, H.Pu, C.Search and P.M eystre, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 060401 (2002).
- [31] H. Pu, W. Zhang and P. Meystre, e-print condmat/0203066.
- [32] K.Goral, L.Santos and M.Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 170406 (2002).