# Bose-E instein condensates in a one-dim ensional double square well: A nalytical solutions of the N on linear Schrodinger equation

K.W.Mahmud<sup>1</sup>, J.N.Kutz<sup>2</sup>, and W.P.Reinhardt<sup>1;3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195–1560, USA

 $^2\mathrm{D}\,\mathrm{epartm}\,\mathrm{ent}$  of A pplied M athem atics, U niversity of W ashington, Seattle, W A 98195-2420

<sup>3</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1700, USA

(April 14, 2024)

W e present a representative set of analytic stationary state solutions of the N onlinear Schrödinger equation for a sym m etric double square well potential for both attractive and repulsive nonlinearity. In addition to the usual sym metry preserving even and odd states, nonlinearity introduces quite exotic sym metry breaking solutions - am ong them are trains of solitons with di erent num ber and sizes of density lum ps in the two wells. We use the sym metry breaking localized solutions to form m acroscopic quantum superposition states and explore a sim ple model for the exponentially sm all tunneling splitting.

## I. IN TRODUCTION

M any features of B ose-E instein condensates (BEC s) of dilute atom ic gases in a single well external potential at zero tem perature are well described by mean eld theory [1,2]. In the mean eld picture all condensate atom s have the sam e m acroscopic wave function satisfying the G ross-P itaevskii (GP) equation. In this paper we investigate the stationary states of BEC in a sym metric double square well potential. We nd analytic solutions of the GP equation for both symmetry preserving and symmetry breaking stationary states of the attractive and repulsive nonlinearity. The solutions presented in the paper give such analytic expressions for what are seen to be stationary soliton trains in the double well-am ong them are such trains with di erent num ber and sizes of density lum ps in the two wells. Single dark solitons [3,4], bright soliton [5] and soliton trains [6] have been recently experim entally observed in trapped BECs, suggesting that their double well analogs m ay be experim entally accessible. In addition we present, as an application of the mean eld symmetry breaking solutions, a zero order macroscopic mean eld descriptions of macroscopic quantum superposition states (Schrodinger Cat state) in a double well BEC system .

Symmetry breaking mean eld solutions, such as we observe in this exact treatments, are expected in the attractive case as an attractive condensate in the ground state tends to localize in one wellor the other. Symmetry breaking solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation was rst pointed out in the context of molecular states [7]. Symmetry breaking mean eld states for repulsive condensates have been discussed in the two-state model of condensate dynam ics in a double well [8{11], and seen in the nonlinear num erical studies of the GP equation in a sym m etric quartic double well [12]. The present analytic work thus con mm s the num erical work of D'A gosta and P resilla in R ef. [12] in the context of a double square well. Such m acroscopic quantum self-trapped states have also appeared on the studies of transport on a dim erm odeled by discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation [13].

BECs in a double well and multi-well systems have been studied in the context of coherence [14], Josepson tunneling [8,15,16], squeezed states [17], the super uid to M ott transition [18] and condensate fragm entation [19]. In discussions of condensate tunneling it is well known that a high barrier leads to condensate fragm entation in which two or more distinct single particle states are m acroscopically occupied. For a repulsive condensate, raising the barrier leads to the condensate in the two wells from being coherent to being incoherent in a Fock state [19]. The analysis herein gives the nonlinearm odes of the entire double well in a mean eld picture when all the atom s have the sam e single particle w avefunction. Correlation e ects leading to condensate fragmentation are neglected here and thus the theory presented applies directly only to the case of strong tunneling. However, the mean eld states obtained could form the basis for a correlated description.

The GP equation is a cubic nonlinear Schrodinger equation (NLSE) [20] where the particle interactions give rise to such e ective nonlinearity. The NLSE has been successful in modeling many other natural phenom enon besides BEC. It describes light pulses in optical bers [21], helical excitations of a vortex line [22], Bose-condensed photons [23], spin waves in magnetic materials [24], and disordered media [25]. Despite being a canonical physics problem [26], the symmetric double square well problem has not, to our know ledge, been solved for nonlinear Schrodinger equation. A lthough the discussions in the paper is exclusively for Bose-E instein condensates, the analysis will apply to any system satisfying cubic NLSE.

The symmetry breaking localized one particle mean eld states can be used to form a zero order twocon guration Schrödinger cat states of the form  $\sum_{left}^{N}$ 

 $_{right}^{N}$ . There have been several reports of the creation of Schrodinger cat states in various condensed matter systems [27,28]. In the context of BEC, several authors have suggested producing such states [11,29{32],

although none have been demonstrated experimentally. In a double well, as is found analytically in this paper, the mean eld ground state for an attactive condensate is a symmetry breaking state localized in one of the wells. The superposition of such degenerate localized states is a \cat" state. We calculate the tunneling splittings for such states using correct mean eld single particle states starting from the full N-body Ham iltonian. Such two-con guration tunneling splittings are exponentially sm all in the N-body wave function overlap. Particle correlations are still neglected, but strong mean eld e ects accounted for.

The article is organized as follows. In Sec. II we present the full set of sym metry preserving and sym metry breaking analytic solutions of stationary NLSE for a sym metric double square wellpotential. In Sec. III we discuss an application of the sym metry breaking solutions - the possibility of creating superpositions of macroscopic quantum states, and calculate the tunneling splittings of such cat states. Remarks and discussions in Sec. IV conclude the paper.

#### II.DOUBLE SQUARE W ELL

The stationary NLSE with a potential has the form

$$[ \theta_{x}^{2} + jf(x) j + V^{trap}(x) ]f(x) = f(x); \quad (1)$$

where f(x) is the mean eld condensate wavefunction in the longitudinal direction, is the eigenvalue or the chemical potential, and is the nonlinearity parameter which is proportional to the number of atom s and the s-wave scattering length. All quantities in Eq.(1) are dimensionless.

A nalytic solutions of the GP equation for harmonic and quartic double well potentials are not possible, so we have chosen to investigate the in nite square well with symmetrically placed nite rectangular potential barrier. The potential is of the form

$$V^{\text{trap}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ 0 & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ 0 & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ V_{o}, & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \end{pmatrix}$$
 (2)

For clarity, Fig.1 shows a picture of this potential. Double well traps can be created in experiments with a combination of optical and magnetic trapping. Varying the laser strengths the barrier or the depth and the width of the trap can be easily tailored to experimental specications. The double well traps created in experiments usually have gaussian barriers; however, the qualitative behavior of the stationary states of such wells would be the same as discussed in this paper for a double square

We present the analytic solutions of Eq.(1) with the potential Eq.(2). Solutions in an in nite welland a nite well have been presented for both attractive and repulsive condensates [33{35}. In Eq.(1) > 0 corresponds

well.

to repulsive condensate while < 0 corresponds to attractive condensate. The solutions of NLSE in a zero potential are Jacobian Elliptic functions [36]. Such functions are well known in the soliton literature, and also as the solution to the anharm onic classical oscillator, i.e.  $^{3}=3!=0$ . An example of the standard notation for Jacobi E lliptic functions is sn (x jm), where m is the elliptic parameter. The period is given by 4K (m), where K (m) is the complete elliptic integral. The value of m is bounded between 0 and 1. It interpolates the elliptic functions between trigonom etric and hyperbolic functions. There are 12 elliptic functions all of which are solutions to the NLSE. Of the 12 elliptic functions, six are bounded and six are unbounded. Of the six bounded functions, only sn (x jm ), cn (x jm ), dn (x jm ) have distinct physical form s. O thers di er only by a translational shift or a rescaling of the amplitude. The six unbounded functions can be represented as a quotient of the above three functions in di erent combinations. We will nd that the pieces of these unbounded functions are those appropriate in the barrier region of the double well for a repulsive condensate. Table I sum m arizes the functions relevant to this work.

Solutions in the three regions will be written in the form

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 8 \\ < f_1(x); & a < x < b \\ f_2(x); & jxj & b \\ \vdots & f_3(x); & b < x < a \end{cases}$$
(3)

The solutions vanish on and outside the hard wallboundary at jxj a. The solutions will be found subject to continuity of f(x) and  $f^{0}(x)$  at x = b and the norm alization condition  $a^{a} dx f(x)f = 1$ . The vanishing of the solutions at the hard walls is taken as built into the elliptic functions and does not form an additional boundary condition. The solutions are divided into two di erent categories - Symmetry preserving and Symmetry breaking. Taking advantage of the symmetry of the problem

nding symmetry preserving states reduce to solving a set of three nonliear algebraic equations. The symmetry breaking states require solving ve simultaneous nonlinear equations which is a farm ore di cult undertaking.

## A .Sym m etry preserving states

Sym m etry preserving states are the states that preserve the sym m etry of the N-particle m any-body H am iltonian. Sim ply put, they are the even and odd solutions. A swe will nd out in the next section, there can also be solutions which does not preserve even/odd sym m etry expected from linear quantum m echanics.

#### 1. A ttractive nonlinearity

Symmetric solutions take the following form

$$f_1(x) = A cn(k(x + a) K(m)jm);$$
 (4a)

$$f_2(x) = A_2 dn (k_2 x + K (m_2) jm_2);$$
 (4b)

$$f_3(x) = A cn(k(x a) + K(m)jm);$$
 (4c)

and antisymm etric solutions take the form

$$f_1(x) = A cn(k(x + a) K(m)jm);$$
 (5a)

$$f_2(x) = A_2 cn(k_2x + K(m_2) jm_2);$$
 (5b)

$$f_3(x) = A cn(k(x a) + K(m)jm);$$
 (5c)

where A, A<sub>2</sub>, k, k<sub>2</sub>, m and m<sub>2</sub> are free parameters. f<sub>1</sub>(x) and f<sub>3</sub>(x) have been chosen to preserve odd and even parity. Note that the elliptic parameter K (m<sub>2</sub>) displaces the cn in the barrier region to make it antisym metric. In the next section we describe uniquely nonlinear type solutions which does not preserve such parity. The condition that the states vanish at the hard walls at a and -a are built into the form of the solutions.

Sym m etric and antisym m etric solutions are solved using the sam e m ethod. Substituting the sym m etric solutions into Eq. (1) with the potential Eq. (2), following conditions are obtained

$$A^2 = 2m k^2 = ; A_2^2 = 2k_2^2 =$$
 (6a)

$$= (1 \quad 2m)k^2; = (m_2 \quad 2)k_2^2 + V_o \quad (6b)$$

The boundary condition  $f_1(b) = f_2(b)$  is equivalent to  $f_2(b) = f_3(b)$ , and requires

$$A cn(k! K (m) jm) = A_2 dn(k_2b + K (m_2) jm_2)$$
 (7)

where ! a b is the width of each of the wells. C ontinuity of the rst derivative requires

Ak sn (k! K (m) jm) dn (k! K (m) jm) = 
$$A_2m_2k_2$$
  
sn (  $k_2b + K$  (m 2) jm 2) cn (  $k_2b + K$  (m 2) jm 2) (8)

F inally, the norm alization condition is

$$2A^{2} dx cn^{2} (k (x a) + K (m) jm)$$

$$Z^{b}_{b}$$

$$+ 2A^{2}_{2} dx dn^{2} (k_{2}x + K (m_{2}) jm_{2}) = 1:$$
(9)

Eq. (9) can be written as

$$\frac{2A_{2}^{2}}{k_{2}} \mathbb{E} (k_{2}b + K (m_{2}) jm_{2}) \mathbb{E} (m_{2})] \frac{2A^{2}}{m} (1 m)! \\ + \frac{2A^{2}}{m k} \mathbb{E} (m) \mathbb{E} (k! + K (m) jm)] = 1:$$
(10)

where E  $(k_2 l jm)$  is standard notation for an incomplete elliptic integral [36].

Equating of Eqs. (6b) gives us a constraint on the energy. Substitution of Eqs. (6a) into Eqs. (7), (8), and

(10) produces a system of four simultaneous equations – an energy condition, a nontrivial normalization and two enforcing the continuity of the wavefunction and its rst derivative at the interior discontinuity of the potential. The four equations can be reduced to three equations in three unknowns. These are

$$P = \frac{1}{m} k cn (k! K (m) jm)$$
  
= dn ( b+ K (m<sub>2</sub>) jm<sub>2</sub>) (11a)

$$\frac{p_{m}k^{2} \operatorname{sn}(k! \quad K(m) \operatorname{jm}) \operatorname{dn}(k! \quad K(m) \operatorname{jm}) = m_{2}^{2}}{\operatorname{sn}(b + K(m_{2}) \operatorname{jm}_{2}) \operatorname{cn}(b + K(m_{2}) \operatorname{jm}_{2}) (11b)}$$

$$\frac{4}{2} \mathbb{E} (b + K (m_2) jm_2) \mathbb{E} (m_2)] \frac{4k^2}{2} (1 m)! + \frac{4k}{2} \mathbb{E} (m) \mathbb{E} (k! + K (m) jm)] = 1: (11c)$$

where =  $\frac{4 \frac{V_0 (1 2m)k^2}{2m_2}}{2m_2}$  k<sub>2</sub> and ! a b. This is a system of three nonlinear algebraic equations with three unknown variables m, m<sub>2</sub> and k and four experimental parameters – the box width 2a, barrier height V<sub>0</sub>, barrier width 2b and nonlinearity parameter .

This system of equation Eqs. (11) is analogous to the set of equations for linear Schrodinger equation for a particle on a box double well potential [26]. However, the norm alization equation Eq. (11c) here is nontrivial and gives an additional condition. These equations can ideally be solved by a multidim ensional secant m ethod, and that is the m ethod we use to nd the roots. How ever, the nonlinear parameter space is too large to choose a good starting point for the roots to converge. A swe will see in the next section when we dealw ith a set of ve equations for the symm etry breaking solutions, it is alm ost in possible to nd the roots and the analytic solutions w ithout a good initial choice of parameters from an approximate num erical solution.

Such num erical approxim ations to the exact solutions of Eq.(1) with the double well potential Eq.(2) can be generated by the shooting method [37]. However, the cubic nonlinearity generated from the mean-eld interactions of the atom s introduces num erical sti ness into the resulting two-point boundary value problem. To accurately compute the num erical solutions, G ear's methods [38] are employed which are e cient in overcom ing the num erical sti ness by utilizing backward di erencing form ulas. The resulting shooting scheme is then easily im plem ented and both the norm alized symm etry preserving and symm etry-breaking states are computed along with their chemical potential. We note that by adjusting the shooting angle, the norm alization to unity can be satis ed.

K now ing the chem ical potential and the value of the solution at barrier boundary x = b from the shooting routine num erics we can not the three approxim ate roots of Eqs. (11). With the form of the solutions and the approxim ate roots at hand, secant m ethod is used to solve

the Eqs. (11) to nd the exact analytic solutions. In Fig.2 we show the rst four odd and even states. The states are ordered according to the chem ical potential . A barrier height of  $V_{\circ} = 100$ , barrier width of 2b = 1=5, well width 2a = 1 and nonlinearity of = 100 were used. Table II shows the solution parameters for F ig 2. The true mean eld ground state for an attractive condensate in this case is a symmetry breaking state where the condensate localizes in one well or the other as is described in the next section. The st excited even state for this well in Fig. 2 (c) where the condensate has one of the peaks on top of the barrier is a uniquely nonlinear state [12] which does not have any counterpart in linear Schrödinger equation. For  $> V_{o}$  all even solutions are of this kind, how ever even for  $\langle V_{\circ} \rangle$  strong nonlinearity can give rise to such states. Symmetric solutions of this kind has the form  $f_2(x) = A_2 \operatorname{cn}(k_2 x \operatorname{jm}_2)$ .

The antisymmetric solutions were found using a similar method. For reference the system of equations is  $\Pr_{m_2}$  cn( b + K (m\_2);m\_2) =  $\Pr_{m}$  kcn(k (a b) K (m);m);  $\Pr_{m_2}^2$  sn( b + K (m\_2);m\_2)dn( b + K (m\_2);m\_2) =  $\Pr_{m}^2 k^2 sn(k! - K (m);m)dn(k! K (m);m); \frac{4}{2} \mathbb{E} (b + K (m_2) jm_2) = (m_2)] \frac{4k^2}{2k^2} (1 m)! \frac{4^2}{2} (1 m_2)b + \frac{4k}{2} (E (m) - E (k! + K (m) jm)) = 1, where = <math>\frac{q}{\frac{V_0 + (1 2m)k^2}{2m_2 - 1}} k_2.$ 

W e would like to note that unlike linear quantum mechanics, for attractive condensate the eigenvalue or chem – ical potential of the antisym metric state for this well dimensions has a lower value than the symmetric case. This behaviour is only true for strong nonlinearity. The total energy per particle for the antisymmetric state is how – ever always greater than the symmetric case. Similar behavior of symmetric and antisymmetric state chemical potentials has also been found in the case of ring potentials [33].

#### 2. Repulsive nonlinearity

Symmetric solutions take the form

$$f_1(x) = A sn(k(x + a) jm);$$
 (12a)

$$f_2(x) = A_2 ds(k_2 x + K (m_2) jm_2);$$
 (12b)

$$f_3(x) = A sn(k(x a) jm);$$
 (12c)

and antisym m etric solutions take the form

$$f_1(x) = A sn(k(x + a) jm);$$
 (13a)

$$f_2(x) = A_2 cs(k_2 x + K (m_2) jm_2);$$
 (13b)

$$f_3(x) = A sn(k(x a) jm);$$
 (13c)

Substitution of the set solutions into Eq. (1) with the double wellpotential Eq. (2) gives the following equations for the amplitude and the chemical potential

$$A^2 = 2m k^2 = ; A_2^2 = 2k_2^2 =$$
 (14a)

= 
$$(1 + m)k^2$$
; =  $(2m_2 \ 1)k_2^2 + V_o$  (14b)

Just like for the attractive case the three simultaneous equations obtained from the boundary conditions, norm alization and the energy conditions are following

$$p_{\overline{m}} k sn (k! jm) = ds(b + K (m_2) jm_2); (15a)$$

$$p_{\overline{m}} k^2 cn (k! jm) dn (k! jm) = 2$$

$$cs(b + K (m_2) jm_2) ns(b + K (m_2) jm_2) (15b)$$

$$4^{2}b = 4^{2}m_{2}b = + \frac{4k^2}{!}!$$

$$+ \frac{2}{!} [cs(b + K (m_2) jm_2) dn(b + K (m_2) jm_2)]$$

$$cs(b + K (m_2) jm_2) dn(b + K (m_2) jm_2)]$$

$$\frac{2}{!} [E(b + K (m_2) jm_2) + E(b + K (m_2) jm_2)]$$

$$\frac{4k}{2}E$$
 (k! jm) = 1 (15c)

where =  $\frac{1}{\frac{(1+m)k^2 V_o}{1 2m_2}}$  k<sub>2</sub>. A similar set of equations is obtained for the antisym metric case.

The ground state and the rst three symmetry preserving excited states are shown in Fig. (3). The well dimensions used here are dimensions that the attractive case which was chosen to show the peculiarities of attractive condensate. A barrier height of  $V_o = 1000$ , barrier width of 2b = 1=10, well width 2a = 1 and nonlinearity of = 100 were used here. Table II shows the solution parameters for Fig.3. In addition to the even and odd excited states there can also be symmetry breaking states as described in the next section. For a repulsive condensate the lowest symmetry preserving state is always the ground state.

## B.Sym m etry breaking states

Symmetry breaking states are uniquely nonlinear states where di erent size or number of  $\lim ps"$  are present in the two wells. Such stationary states with strong localization and di erent number of nodes in the two symmetric wells are not possible for linear Sturm – Liouville system s. Finding such solutions con rm s and extends the numerical work [12] and the two state tunneling m odels [8{10,39} of the double well where m acroscopic quantum self-trapping has been predicted. On the N-particle level the stationary states should preserve the symmetry of the H am iltonian and can only be symmetric and antisymmetric. So these asymmetric states arise due to the nonlinearity associated with the mean eld approximation.

In the work of D'A gosta and P resilla [12] a non-linear trial function and relaxation method for patial di erential equations was used to numerically nd both the symmetry preserving and symmetry breaking states of the GP equation in a symmetric harmonic/quartic double well. The di cult task of choosing the right trial functions and the possibility of false minimal leading to artifacts in such m ethods m otivated us to treat the m odel double square w ellpotential and to nd the roots of these algebraic equations, and thus nd the exact analytic solutions. The qualitative behaviour of solutions in any sym m etric double potential should be the same as ours, and w herever the set of param eters w e used overlaps with those of R ef [12] there is one-to-one correspondence in the solutions.

#### 1. A ttractive nonlinearity

Solutions  $\boldsymbol{w}$  ith no nodes inside the barrier region take the form

$$f_1(x) = A_1 cn(k_1(x + a) K(m_1) jm_1);$$
 (16a)

$$f_2(x) = A_2 dn (k_2 (x + d) + K (m_2) jm_2);$$
 (16b)

$$f_3(x) = A_3 cn(k_3(x a) + K(m_3) jm_3);$$
 (16c)

and solutions with nodes inside the barrier are

$$f_1(x) = A_1 cn(k_1(x + a)) K(m_1) jm_1);$$
 (17a)

$$f_2(x) = A_2 cn(k_2(x + d) + K(m_2) jm_2);$$
 (17b)

$$f_3(x) = A_3 cn(k_3(x a) + K(m_3) jm_3);$$
 (17c)

d in Eqs. (16) and (17) is a measure of how far the solution under the barrier is displaced from being symmetric. The amplitudes and the chemical potentials are

$$A_{1}^{2} = 2m_{1}k_{1}^{2} = ;A_{2}^{2} = 2k_{2}^{2} = ;A_{3}^{2} = 2m_{3}k_{3}^{2} = (18a)$$
  
= (1 2m\_{1})k\_{1}^{2}; = (m\_{2} 2)k\_{2}^{2} + V\_{o};  
= (1 2m\_{3})k\_{3}^{2} (18b)

The set of ve equations in ve unknowns are

$$p_{\overline{m_1}}$$
 cn( \_3 (m\_1) jm\_1) = dn( \_1 (d;m\_2) jm\_2); (19)

$$p = \frac{1}{m_3} = cn(_4 (m_3) jm_3) = dn(_2 (d; m_2) jm_2);$$
 (20)

$$p_{\overline{m_{1}}}^{2} sn(_{3}(m_{1}) jm_{1}) dn(_{3}(m_{1}) jm_{1}) = m_{2}^{2} sn(_{1}(d;m_{2}) jm_{2}) cn(_{1}(d;m_{2}) j_{2});$$
(21)

$$p_{\overline{m_{3}}}^{2} sn(_{4}(m_{3}) jm_{3}) dn(_{4}(m_{3}) jm_{3})$$
  
=  $m_{2}^{2}^{2} sn(_{2}(d;m_{2}) jm_{2}) cn(_{2}(d;m_{2}) j_{2});$  (22)

$$\frac{2^{2}}{2} (1 m_{3})! + \frac{2}{2} \mathbb{E} (m_{3}) \mathbb{E} (4 (m_{3}) jm_{3})]$$

$$\frac{2^{2}}{2} (1 m_{1})! + \frac{2}{2} \mathbb{E} (m_{1}) + \mathbb{E} (3 (m_{1}) jm_{1})]$$

$$\frac{2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( 2 (d; m_2) j m_2 \right) \mathbb{E} \left( 1 (d; m_2) j m_2 \right) = 1$$
(23)

where =  $q - \frac{1}{1 2m_1}$  k<sub>1</sub>, =  $q - \frac{v_0}{m_2 2}$  k<sub>2</sub>, =  $q - \frac{1}{1 2m_3}$  k<sub>3</sub>,  $_1(d;m_2) = k_2(d - b) + K(m_2)$ ,  $_2(d;m_2) = k_2(d + b) + K(m_2)$ ,  $_3(m_1) = ! K(m_1)$  and  $_4$  (m<sub>3</sub>) = ! + K (m<sub>3</sub>). This is a set of ve nonlinear equations in ve unknowns m<sub>1</sub>, m<sub>2</sub>, m<sub>3</sub>, d and . A sim ilar set of equations are obtained for the solutions that has nodes inside the barrier.

As described in the previous section we use a shooting m ethod to nd the approxim ate numerical solutions. K nowing the eigenvalue and the values of the functions at the barrier boundaries at x = b, we can reduce ve equations with ve unknowns to equations with two unknowns. W ith just two unknowns we can use a graphical m ethod [35] to nd the approximate solutions. Such approximate roots are then used to nd the exact analytic roots of these ve equations using a multidim ensional secant m ethod, and thus we obtain the analytic solution of the symmetry breaking states. W ithout a good bracketing on the roots obtained from rst solving it numerically its extrem ely unlikely for a secant m ethod to converge for a set of ve nonlinear equations.

For Fig. 4 we use a well dimension of 2a = 1, 2b = 1=10,  $V_0 = 1000$  and nonlinearity = 100. We use a dierent well dimension here than the attractive symmetric case just to show the varieties of asymmetric solutions. Table III shows the solution parameters for Fig.4. The solutions can be classi ed as multiple node solutions zero node, one node, two node and such. The lowest symmetry breaking state for attractive condensate is the ground state of the system as the clustering of particles in one of the wells m in in izes the energy for strong enough self interaction. There can be ground and excited state solutions with assym etrically placed peaks on top of the barrier. The analytic form of such solutions is  $f_2(x) = A_2 \operatorname{cn}(k_2(x + d) jm_2)$ . For an asymmetric ground state, increasing the barrier height localizes the condensate m ore into the well, on the other hand increasing the barrier width pushes the peak of the condensate density more towards the center of the well on top of the barrier.

Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 are the bright soliton solutions in a double well. It shows the one, two, three and four soliton solutions. Bright soliton and soliton trains have recently been observed in attractive condensates of <sup>7</sup>Li [5,6]. Unlike stationary soliton trains of equal density lumps in a single potential well, double wellgeom etry has stationary soliton train solutions with unequal density lumps as is shown in Fig. 4. There exists a whole class of such m any-soliton solutions. As an example, Fig. 5 shows an analytic solution of a symmetry breaking eight-soliton bright soliton train in a well of dimensions 2a = 1, 2b = 0.1,  $V_0 = 1000$ , and for nonlinearity = 500.

## 2. Repulsive nonlinearity

Solutions with no nodes inside the barrier are

$$f_1(x) = A_1 sn (k_1 (x + a) jm_1); \qquad (24a)$$

$$f_2(x) = A_2 ds(k_2(x + d) + K(m_2) jm_2);$$
 (24b)

$$f_3(x) = A_3 sn(k_3(x a) jm_3);$$
 (24c)

Solutions with nodes inside the barrier are

$$f_1(x) = A_1 \operatorname{sn}(k_1(x + a) \operatorname{jm}_1);$$
 (25a)

$$f_2(x) = A_2 cs(k_2(x + d) + K(m_2) jm_2);$$
 (25b)

$$f_3(x) = A_3 sn(k_3(x a) jm_3);$$
 (25c)

T he am plitude and chem ical potentials for the states that has no nodes inside the barrier are

$$A_{1}^{2} = 2m_{2}k_{1}^{2} = ;A_{2}^{2} = 2k_{2}^{2} = ;A_{3}^{2} = 2m_{3}k_{3}^{2} = (26a)$$
  
$$= (1 + m_{1})k_{1}^{2}; = (1 - 2m_{2})k_{2}^{2} + V_{o};$$

$$_{3} = (1 + m_{3})k_{3}^{2}$$
 (26b)

For reference the equations are

n

n

$$p = \frac{1}{m_1} \sin(! jm_1) = ds(_1(d;m_2) jm_2)$$
 (27)

$$p = \frac{1}{m_3} \sin((1 + jm_3)) = ds((2 + djm_2) jm_2)$$
 (28)

$$= {}^{P} \frac{1}{m_{1}} {}^{2} cn(!;m_{1})dn(!;m_{1})$$

$$= {}^{2} ns(_{1}(d;m_{2}) jm_{2})cs(_{1}(d;m_{2}) jm_{2})$$
(29)

$$= \frac{2 \operatorname{rs}(2 (\operatorname{d;m}_{2}) \operatorname{jm}_{3}) \operatorname{dn}(1 \operatorname{jm}_{3})}{2 \operatorname{rs}(2 (\operatorname{d;m}_{2}) \operatorname{jm}_{2}) \operatorname{cs}(2 (\operatorname{d;m}_{2}) \operatorname{jm}_{2})}$$
(30)

$$4^{2}b = 4^{2}m_{2}b = + \frac{2^{2}!}{2!} + \frac{2^{2}!}{2!} + \frac{2^{2}!}{2!} + \frac{2^{2}}{2!} + \frac{2^{2}!}{2!} + \frac{2^$$

where the same notations as in the attractive case has been used. Here the ve unknown variables are  $m_1, m_2, m_3, d, and ;$ , and are functions of the elliptic parameters and the chemical potential . A similar set of equations is obtained for the solutions that has nodes inside the barrier.

The rst four states are plotted in Fig. 6 for a nonlinearity of = 100 and the same well dimension as the repulsive symmetry preserving case, 2a = 1, 2b = 1=10 and  $V_o = 1000$ . Table III shows the solution parameters for Fig.6. Again the solutions can be classi ed as onenode, two-node, three-node symmetry breaking states. For repulsive condensates the asymmetric ground state has a much higher energy and is in fact the second excited state of the double well. Note that for the two two-node solutions keeping one node inside the barrier and another outise the barrier is energetically more favorable than having two nodes outside the barrier. In Fig. 7 we show the symmetry breaking ground state as we change the nonlinearity. It evolves from being alm ost localized for sm all nonlinearity to having three distinct density lum ps for high enough nonlinearity.

## III.SCHROD INGER CAT STATE OF BEC IN A DOUBLE W ELL

As was shown in the previous section, the mean eld ground state of attractive condensate and some of the excited states of both attractive and repulsive condensate are symmetry breaking states. For the symmetry breaking localized states such as the attractive ground state, coherent quantum tunneling between the degenerate states rem oves the degeneracy and form s a superposition of the mean eld states. Such localized superposition states of the form N left N are Schrödinger cat states. On the other hand, the usual even and odd symmetry preserving delocalized states of the form  $^{N} = (_{left} _{right})^{N}$  are not traditional Schrödinger cat states. For the cat states, tunneling splitting is exponentially sm all in the N-body wave function overlap. In the following we nd the zero order two-con guration m ean eld cat state tunneling splitting starting with the N-particle H am iltonian with pseudopotential interaction. It has not gone unnoticed that the ground state of the attractive condensate is cat-like [40,41]. C irac et al. [11] have studied the ground state of Josephson-coupled twospecies condensates which has sim ilarities with condensate in a double well. In the next section we deliberate on the experim ental realization of cat states of BEC in a double well.

## A . Schrodinger cat state tunneling splitting

The N-body Ham iltonian for a system of N weakly interacting identical bosons each of mass m in an external potential  $V_{\rm ext}$  is

$$H_{N} = \frac{X^{N}}{\sum_{i=1}^{M}} \frac{h^{2}}{2m} r_{i}^{2} + V_{ext}(r_{i}) + 1 = 2 X_{i6 j} V(r_{i}; r_{j});$$
(32)

Here V  $(r_i;r_j) = g$   $(r_i - r_j)$  is the Ferm i contact' pseudo-potential, and  $g = \frac{4 - a_s h^2}{m}$  where  $a_s$  is the s-wave scattering length characterizing the binary atom ic collisions.

For a fully condensed Bose condensate the N-body wavefunction can be written as a symmetric product of single-particle wave functions

$$_{N}$$
 (r<sub>1</sub>; r<sub>2</sub>; ...; r<sub>N</sub>) = (r<sub>1</sub>) (r<sub>2</sub>) ... (r<sub>N</sub>) <sup>N</sup> (33)

where  $(r_i)$ 's are the single particle mean eld wavefunctions normalized to unity drj f = 1.

The expectation value gives us the N particle mean eld energy

$$h^{N} H_{N} j^{N} i = N \frac{N(N+1)}{2}g^{Z} dr j j^{4}$$
(34)

where is the chemical potential. We can generalize these to the left and right localized GP solutions in a double well, which in the above equatin would correspond to replacing by  $_{\rm L}$  and  $_{\rm R}$ . The expectation value with respect to the left and right localized states contains overlap integrals which no longer vanishes because of their non-orthogonality –

$$h_{L}^{N} \neq_{N} j_{R}^{N} i = \frac{N(N-1)}{2} g^{Z} dr(_{L})^{2} g^{R} ()^{N-2} g^{N}^{2} dr_{L} j_{R} j_{R}^{2} dr_{L} j_{R} j_{R}^{2} ()^{N-1} + N ()^{N} (35)$$

where =  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ dr \\ L \\ R \end{bmatrix}$  is the overlap integral. The even and odd combinations of the left and right localized solutions  $\begin{bmatrix} N \\ right \end{bmatrix}$  are a two con guration model for Schrödinger cat superposition states. Taking L and Rto be real, the expectation value of the energy at this sim plest level of approximation is

$$E_{S,A} = \frac{h_{L}^{N} \mathcal{H}_{N} j_{L}^{N} i h_{L}^{N} \mathcal{H}_{N} j_{R}^{N} i}{1 h_{L} j_{R} i^{N}}$$
(36)

A lthough this equation is identical in appearance with Eq.(20) of C irac et al. [11], our use and inclusion of the exact m ean eld e ect on the fully localized left and right well solutions di er from their treatment of spinor condensates. The tunneling splitting is the di erence in antisym m etric and sym m etric energy

$$E = E_A E_S \tag{37}$$

For the case when the overlap is extrem em ly sm all and for a large number of particles the norm alization factor in the denom inator can be ignored and the splitting can be written as

$$E = 2 N ()^{N} + 2gN^{2} dr_{L}j_{R}j_{R} ()^{N-1}$$

$$Z$$

$$N (N = 1)g dr_{L}^{2} r_{R}^{2} ()^{N-2} (38)$$

This shows explicitly how the cat state tunneling splitting depends on the overlap of the localized single particle mean eld wave functions. However, in our calculations we nd the exact splitting by use of Eq. (37) since physically realizable splitting can only be generated for a signi cant overlap such that we cannot completely ignore the the  $^{\rm N}$  term in the denominator. Since is always less than 1 the splitting is exponentially sm all in the wavefunction overlap.

We use the solution of the one-dimensional GP equation Eq. (1) to nd the tunneling splitting and its dependence on other quantities. The conversion factor to get the energy from a dimensionless quantity is  $h^2 = (2m \ l^2)$  [35], where l is the length of the box. To nd the splittings in one dimension, the coupling constant by should be replaced by the dimensionless elective onedimensional coupling constant  $g_{eff}$ . The dimensionless nonlinearity of the NLSE Eq. (1) is related to  $g_{\rm eff}$  by the realtionship =  $g_{\rm eff}N$ , where N is the total num – ber of particles. For experim ental purposes where a condensate is three dimensional or can be quasi-one dimensional the elective coupling constant  $g_{\rm eff}$  depends on the transverse dimensions of the trap, the species of atoms (whether attractive or repulsive) and the total number of particles in a nonlinear and nontrivial way. Even without knowing the exact  $g_{\rm eff}$  for realistic three dimensional condensate we can explore the dependence of the tunneling splittings on the number of particles N and on the effective coupling constant  $g_{\rm eff}$  and the transverse dimensions of realistic double well traps that will give the correct experimental predictions is under investigation.

### B.D iscussions

Pairs of symmetry breaking mean eld states in a double well are shown in Fig. 8, coherent tunneling between these will produce a cat state. Experimentally such m acroscopic cat states could be observed by starting with a localized attractive condensate in the lower well of an asymmetric double well potential, and then varying the symmetry of the two wells. In Fig. 9 we show the log of tunneling splitting for a condensate of <sup>7</sup>Lias a function of particle number for a double well. separated by 75 in a box width of dim ensions 12.5 and barrier height of  $V_o = 133$ . A constant of 100 e ective coupling constant of  $g_{eff} = 0.145$  has been assumed. In Fig. 10 we show the log of tunneling splitting in the same well as a function of  $jg_{\text{eff}}$  j for a xed num ber of particles - in this case for 500 particles. For a cat state, with the addition of more and more particles the single particle overlap becom es sm aller, and the tunneling splitting becomes vanishingly small due to its exponential dependence on the overlap and the num ber of particles. Fig. 11 shows the GP single particle tunneling splitting between the attractive antisymm etric and symmetric state for  $q_{eff} = 0.911$  which sharply contrasts with the cat state tunneling splitting.

For an example of a cat state, for N = 440 and g<sub>eff</sub> = 0:145 the peaks of the degenerate states are asymm etrically placed on top of the barrier and the separation of the peaks is 1.5 , the tunneling splitting 48 H z and the tunneling time 21 m sw hich are within the experim ental range of detection. For higher peak separations the overlap is sm all and the splitting becom es negligible. An optimal cat state with gaussian barriers as is offen used in experiments where the peaks are well separated and the splitting is within the range of detection should be attainable with externally tuning the coupling constant through Feshbach resonance [42]. The number of particles in our study is limited to the order of hundred atom s which is within the range of stability of attractive condensates [43] such as <sup>7</sup>Lior<sup>85</sup>Rb. Changing the

scattering length by Feshbach resonance will allow stable attractive condensates to be prepared with several thousand atom s [6]. For a repulsive condensate, cat states m ay also be prepared m aking use of the excited localized condensate which m ust be tuned to the right regime to get a well localized condensate as shown in Fig. 7 (a).

## IV . C O N C LU S IO N

W e have presented the stationary states of nonlinear Schrodinger equation in one dimension for a symmetric double square well potential for both attractive and repulsive nonlinearity. In addition to the symmetry preserving even and odd states, we nd analytic expressions for symmetry breaking states that have dierent numbers and sizes of density lumps in the two wells. For attractive condensates these provide the analytic solutions of the stationary bright soliton trains in a double well. Sym metry breaking states do not preserve the even and odd parity of the N-particle many-body Ham iltonian. Finding such analytical solution of continous GP equation puts the self trapping states as found num erically [12], in the 'two-state' tunneling models [8{11], and in the discrete nonlinear Schrodinger equation [13] on an exact footing. Such unique symmetry breaking states, which are not possible for a linear Scrodinger equation, results from the nonlinearity introduced by the mean eld approximation.

The superposition of mean eld localized states of the Ν  $_{\rm right}^{\rm N}$  are Schrödinger cat states that arise form N left due to coherent tunneling between the two degenerate states strongly localized in two di erent wells. Attractive condensate in the ground state or repulsive condensate in its symmetry breaking excited state can be used to produce such cat states. In a zero order two conguration model the splitting is exponentially sm all in the N-body wavefunction overlap. Tailoring the width and barrier height of a double well and with adequate num ber of particles in the trap to give the optim al splitting, macroscopic superposition states should be attainable with current BEC technology.

The use of mean eld picture in describing BEC fully debcalized in a double well is valid only when the condensate in the two wells are fully coherent. For su ciently low tunneling, condensate in a double well cannot m aintain its coherence and therefore mean eld analysis of a fully coherent condensate as was presum ed here is not adequate. Such fragm ented condensate with num ber speezed con gurations can only be treated using theories which go beyond mean eld theory. How ever, the availability of the mean eld analytic solutions as presented in this paper provides the zeroth order nonlinear wavefunctions needed to include in portant and large mean eld e ects in models which treat fragm entated condensates.

## ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

W e wish to thank Lincoln Carr and Bernard Deconinck for discussions and Joachim Brand for computational support. Initial phases of this work was supported by NSF Chem istry and Physics.

to whom correspondence should be addressed.

- F.D alfovo, S.G iorgini, L.P.P itaevskii, and S.Stringari, Rev. of M od. Phys. 71, 463 (1999).
- [2] A.J.Leggett, Rev. of M od. Phys. 73, 307 (2001)
- [3] J.Denschlag, J.E.Sim sarian, D.L.Feder, C.W.Clark,
   L.A.Collins, J.Cubizolles, L.Deng, E.W. Hagley, K.
   Helmerson, W.P.Reinhardt, S.L.Rolston, B.I.Schneider, and W.D.Phillips, Science 287, 97 (2000).
- [4] S. Burger, K. Bongs, S. Dettmer, W. Ertmer, K. Sengstock, A. Sanpera, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and M. Lewenstain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 5198 (1999).
- [5] L.K haykovich, F.Schreck, G.Fernari, J.Bourdel, J.Cubizolles, L.D.Carr, Y.Castin, and C.Salomon, Science 296, 1290 (2002).
- [6] K.E.Strecker, G.B.Partridge, A.G.Truscott, and R.G. Hulet, Nature 417, 150 (2002).
- [7] E.B.Davies, Comm. in Math. Phys. 64, 191 (1979).
- [8] A. Smerzi, S. Fantoni, S. Giovanazzi, and S. R. Shenoy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 4950 (1997).
- [9] G.J.M ilburn, J.Comey, E.M. W right, and D.F.W alls, Phys. Rev. A 55, 4318 (1997).
- [10] E. A. O strovskaya, Y. S. K ivshar, M. Lisak, B. Hall, F. Cattani, and D. Anderson, Phys. Rev. A 61, 031601 (2000).
- [11] J. I. Cirac, M. Lewenstein, K. Molmer, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A 57, 1208 (1998).
- [12] R. D'A gosta and C. Presilla, Phys. Rev. A 65, 043609 (2002).
- [13] J.C.Eilbeck, P.S.Lom dahl, and A.C.Scott, Physica 16 D, 318 (1985).
- [14] M.R.Andrews, C.G.Townsend, H.-J.Miesner, D.S. Durfee, D.M.Kurn, and W.Ketterle, Science 275, 637 (1997).
- [15] J. Javanainen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 3164 (1986).
- [16] F. S. Cataliotti, S. Burger, C. Fort, P. M addaloni, F. M inardi, A. Trom bettoni, A. Smerzi, and M. Inguscio, Science 293, 843 (2001).
- [17] C. Orzel, A. K. Tuchman, M. L. Fensclau, M. Yasuda, and M. A. Kasevich, Science 291, 2386 (2001)
- [18] M.Greiner, O.M andel, T.Esslinger, T.W. Hansch, and I.Bloch, Nature 291, 2386 (2001)
- [19] R.W. Spekkens, and J.E.Sipe, Phys. Rev. A. 59, 3868 (1999).
- [20] C. Sulem and P. L. Sulem, The Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation: Self-focusing and W ave Collapse (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999)
- [21] A. Hasegawa, Optical Solitons in Fibers (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990).

- [22] H. Hasim oto, J. Fluid Mech. 51, 477 (1972).
- [23] R. Y. Ciao, I. H. Deutsch, J. C. Garrison, and E.W. Wright, Frontiers in Nonlinear Optics: the Serge Akhm anov Memorial Volume (Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol and Philadelphia, 1993), p. 151.
- [24] B.A.Kalinikos, M.M.Scott, and C.E.Patton, Phys. Rev.Letts. 84, 4697 (2000).
- [25] A.V.M am aev, M.Sa m an, D.Z.Anderson, and A.A. Zozulya, Phys. Rev. A 54, 870 (1996).
- [26] C.Cohen-Tannoudji, B.Diu, and F.Laloe, in Quantum Mechanics (Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1977), Vol. 1, Chap. IV, p.455.
- [27] J.R. Friedman, V. Patel, W. Chen, S.K. Tolpygo, and J.E. Lukens, Nature 406, 43 (2000).
- [28] C. H. van der W al, A. C. J. ter Haar, F. K. W ilhelm, R. N. Schouten, C. J. P. Harmans, T. P. Orlando, S. Lloyd, and J. E. Mooji, Science 290, 773 (2000).
- [29] D. Gordon, and C. M. Savage, Phys. Rev. A 59, 4623 (1999).
- [30] J.A.D unningham, and K.Bumett, JournalofM od.Optics 48, 1837 (2001).
- [31] J. Ruostekoski, M. J. Collett, R. Graham, and D. F. W alls, Phys. Rev. A 57, 511 (1998).
- [32] Directions in Quantum Optics, edited by H. J. Carmichael, R.J.Glauber, and M.O.Scully, (Springer, New York, 2001) pp. 77-87.
- [33] L.D.Carr, C.W. Clark, and W.P.Reinhardt, Phys. Rev.A 62,063611 (2000).
- [34] L.D.Carr, C.W. Clark, and W.P.Reinhardt, Phys. Rev.A 62,063610 (2000).
- [35] L.D.Carr, K.W. M ahm ud, and W.P.Reinhardt, Phys. Rev.A 64, 033603 (2001).
- [36] Handbook of M athem atical Functions, edited by M. A bram ow itz and I.A. Stegun (N ational B ureau of Standards, W ashington, D.C., 1964).
- [37] H.B.Keller, Numerical methods for two-point boundary value problems, (Dover, New York, 1992).
- [38] C.W. Gear, Numerical initial value problems in ordinary di erential equations, (Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1971).
- [39] S.Raghavan, A.Smerzi, S.Fantoni, and S. R.Shenoy, Phys. Rev. A. 59, 620 (1999).
- [40] T.L.Ho, and C.V C iabanu, e-print cond-m at/0011095 (2001).
- [41] Y. Zhou, H. Zhai, R. Lu, Z. Xu, and Lee Chang, e-print cond-m at/0104361 (2001).
- [42] J.L.Roberts, N.R.Claussen, S.L.Comish, E.A.Donley, E.A.Comell, and C.E.W iem an, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 4211 (2001).
- [43] C. C. Bradley, C. A. Sackett, and R. G. Hulet, Phys. Rev.Lett. 78, 985 (1997).



FIG.1. Sym m etric double square well potential: the m odel used in this paper



FIG.2. Shown are the rst four symmetry preserving states for attractive nonlinearity. The barrier walls are at x = 0.1



FIG.3. Shown are the rst four symmetry preserving states for repulsive nonlinearity. The barrier walls are at x=0.05



FIG.4. Shown are the rst four zero-node, one-node and two-node symmetry breaking states for attractive nonlinearity. The barrier walls are at x = 0.05



FIG.5. Shown is a symmetry breaking eight-soliton bright soliton train solution in a double well. The barrier walls are at x = 0.05.



FIG.6. Shown are the rst four one-node, two-node and three-node symmetry breaking states for repulsive nonlinearity. The barrier walls are at x = 0.05



FIG.7. Symmetry breaking repulsive ground state as a function of nonlinearity. The barrier walls are at x = 0.05. (a) = 15, (b) = 30, (c) = 50, (d) = 100



FIG.8. A pair of symmetry breaking solutions that produces the cat states: (a) attractive ground state. (b) repulsive excited state



FIG.9. Cat State tunneling splitting as described in the two con guration model: it shows the exponential dependence of the splitting on the number of particles for a xed coupling constant. Energy is in frequency units of H ertz.



FIG.10. Cat State tunneling splitting as described in the two con guration model: it shows the exponential dependence of the splitting on the elective coupling constant  $j_{eff}$  j. Energy is in frequency units of H ertz.



FIG.11. GP single particle energy splitting between the lowest antisymmetric and symmetric state of an attractive condensate. The splitting of mean eld delocalized states slowly increases with particle number, and this runs in a direction opposite to that of the C at state tunneling splitting. Energy is in frequency units of Hertz

TABLE I. Lim its of Jacobian elliptic functions and integrals. The rst two sn and cn are periodic solutions in the well while dn, cn, ds, and cs are solutins in the barrier region. 4K (m) is the periodicity and the elliptic integrals K (m) and E (m) both play a role in the system of equations which describe the solutions.

	m = 0	m = 1
sn(u jm )	sin (u)	tanh (u)
cn(u jm)	cos(u)	sech (u)
dn(u jm )	1	sech (u)
ds(u jm )	csc (u )	csch (u)
cs(u jm )	cot(u)	csch (u)
K (m)	=2	1
E (m)	=2	1

TABLE II. Solutions parameters for symmetry preserving states of attractive and repulsive nonlinearity for Fig2 and Fig3. The numbers shown are of su cient precision as initial estimate to be used in the numerical solution of the nonlinear equations of section II. However, as m ! 1 use of high precision arithmetic is required.

	m	m <sub>2</sub>	k	
F ig:2a	0 <b>:</b> 9684	0:9959	13:25	164:42
Fig:2b	0 <b>:</b> 9758	0 <b>:</b> 9935	13:04	161 <b>:</b> 90
Fig:2c	0 <b>:</b> 6352	0 <b>:</b> 9298	12:47	42:03
F ig:2d	0 <b>:</b> 4763	0:7426	15:36	11:18
F ig:3a	0 <b>:</b> 8539	0 <b>:</b> 9976	9 <b>:</b> 88	181:06
Fig:3b	0:8514	0 <b>:</b> 9977	9 <b>:</b> 98	184:51
Fig:3c	0 <b>:</b> 4338	0:9912	14:79	313:75
F ig <b>:</b> 3d	0:4313	0 <b>:</b> 9909	15:00	322:24

TABLE III. Solutions parameters for symmetry breaking states of attractive and repulsive nonlinearity for Fig.4 and Fig.6. The numbers shown are of su cient precision as initial estimate to be used in the numerical solution of the nonlinear equations of section II. However, as m ! 1 use of high precision arithmetic is required.

	m 1	m <sub>2</sub>	m <sub>3</sub>	d	
F ig:4a	0:9999	1 10 <sup>8</sup>	1 10 <sup>16</sup>	0 <b>:</b> 0680	625 <b>:</b> 27
F ig:4b	1 10 <sup>8</sup>	0 <b>:</b> 9999	0:7640	0:0618	174 <b>:</b> 10
F ig:4c	0:8257	0 <b>:</b> 9994	0 <b>:</b> 6171	0:0219	62 <b>:</b> 829
F ig:4d	0:8401	0:9992	0 <b>:</b> 6177	0:0184	62 <b>:</b> 820
F ig:6a	0:9273	0 <b>:</b> 9958	0:2612	0 <b>:</b> 0035	243:16
Fig:6b	0:9273	0 <b>:</b> 9959	0:2529	0:0043	248 <b>:</b> 95
F ig:6c	0:9612	0 <b>:</b> 9992	0:0016	0:0491	308:14
F ig:6d	0 <b>:</b> 0787	0 <b>:</b> 9876	0:6012	0:0122	412:30