

# Condensates and correlated boson systems

O. Sørensen, D. V. Fedorov, and A. S. Jensen

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Aarhus, Denmark

**Abstract.** We study two-body correlations in a many-boson system with a hyperspherical approach, where we can use arbitrary scattering length and include two-body bound states. As a special application we look on Bose-Einstein condensation and calculate the stability criterium in a comparison with the experimental criterium and the theoretical criterium from the Gross-Pitaevskii equation.

## 1 Introduction

Bose-Einstein condensates (BEC) of alkali atoms, e.g., Rb and Na, have successfully been created in the last decade [1]. The JILA experiments [2, 3] touch upon the collapse of boson systems at large two-body scattering length  $a_s$  due to the formation of two-body bound states. The stability criterium has recently been measured to be  $N \bar{a}_s \bar{b}_0 < 0.55$  [4], where  $N$  is the number of bosons,  $a_s$  is the two-body s-wave scattering length, and  $b_0^3 = \frac{4\pi}{3} \bar{a}_s^3 \bar{\omega}^3$  with the geometric mean  $\bar{\omega}$  of the angular frequencies of the deformed oscillator. The properties of BEC have largely been accounted for by the Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE) [5, 6] with a zero-range interaction, which reproduces the correct average energy, density distribution, and stability criterium [7]. This approximation is usually successful at low density  $n$ , where the combination  $n \bar{a}_s \bar{b}_0^3$  is very small.

The need for a more realistic potential is becoming more important with the cases of stronger attraction or larger densities, where critical phenomena like collapse of a condensate [2] and the conversion into molecular BEC occur [3]. In addition, the pure mean-field structure of the wave function is not able to account for the correlations between the particles. Attempts on top of the mean-field have been tried, e.g., including pairing correlations between the bosons [8] in the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov formulation. Alternatively the Jastrow ansatz with the many-body wave function as a product of two-body amplitudes have lead to good results for large scattering length [9]. Quantum Monte-Carlo calculations have been applied for a large number of bosons in a density matrix formulation [10], and more detailed studies for smaller numbers [11, 12, 13].

Recently [14] a hyperspherical description analogous to the mean-field yielded the stability criterium  $N \bar{a}_s \bar{a}_b < 0.67$  for a spherical external field. This was extended [15] to treat two-body correlations with realistic finite-range potentials and applied to a small number of particles. Recently [16] this was applied to a large number of particles and some universal scalings were extracted from the results. This paper will review these results and discuss the various structure descriptions possible within the model.

## 2 Theory

We study the  $N$ -boson system of identical, interacting bosons of mass  $m$  trapped by an isotropic harmonic external field of angular frequency  $\omega$ . The total Hamiltonian is then

$$\hat{H}_{\text{total}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hat{p}_i^2}{2m} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} m \omega^2 r_i^2 + \sum_{i < j=1}^N V(r_{ij}) : \quad (1)$$

We focus on the relative degrees of freedom and use hyperspherical coordinates [15]: hyperradius  $\rho$  given by  $\rho^2 = \sum_{i < j} r_{ij}^2 = N$ , where  $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$  and hyperangles  $\Omega$  relating to the remaining  $3N - 4$  relative degrees of freedom. Due to the properties of the harmonic oscillator, the center-of-mass motion separates out, leaving a relative eigenvalue equation:

$$(\hat{H}_{\text{total}} - \hat{H}_{\text{c.m.}} - E) \Psi(\rho, \Omega) = 0 : \quad (2)$$

We factorize the relative wave function as  $\Psi(\rho, \Omega) = \rho^{-(3N-4)/2} f(\rho) Y(\Omega)$ . This way we obtain an effective radial equation for  $f(\rho)$  as the eigenfunction of energy  $E$  in the effective potential  $U(\rho)$

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} + U(\rho) - E f(\rho) = 0 ; \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{2m U(\rho)}{\hbar^2} = \frac{(3N-4)(3N-6)}{4\rho^2} + \frac{(\Omega)}{\rho^2} + \frac{\rho^2}{b_c^4} : \quad (4)$$

Here  $b_c = \sqrt{\hbar/(m\omega)}$  is the length unit of a harmonic trapping potential of frequency  $\omega = \hbar/(2m b_c^2)$ . The  $\Omega$ -dependent  $(\Omega)$  is an effective angular potential, which includes the effects of interactions and correlations.

Assuming then a wave function which is basically a sum, and not a product, of two-body amplitudes as

$$\Psi(\rho, \Omega) = \sum_{i < j} \Psi(\rho; r_{ij}) \quad (5)$$

we are able to solve the angular part of the many-body Schrodinger equation as just a one-dimensional integro-differential equation with up to two-dimensional integrals. In the angular equation we use a finite-range Gaussian  $V(r_{ij}) = V_0 \exp(-r_{ij}^2/b^2)$  as the two-body interaction potential. The only additional approximation consists in assuming that the range  $b$  of this potential

is much smaller than the average distance between the particles. The scattering length  $a_s$  can assume any value, and there can be any number of two-body bound states, at least in principle; in actual calculations the accuracy is better with as few two-body bound states as possible. The usual zero-range interaction used in the mean-field amounts to equating  $a_s$  with the Born-approximation  $a_B$  to the scattering length. In comparison we generally have that  $a_s$  and  $a_B$  differ substantially. The Born-approximation is given by

$$a_B = \frac{m}{2} \int_0^\infty dr r^2 V(r) : \quad (6)$$

When we assume that  $V(r)$  is independent of angular coordinates, the angular potential becomes for  $N \gg 1$

$$V(r) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{N} \int_0^\infty dr r^2 V(r) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{N} \int_0^\infty dr r^2 V(r) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{N} \int_0^\infty dr r^2 V(r) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{N} \int_0^\infty dr r^2 V(r) ; \quad (7)$$

where we due to the mean-field like assumption of no internal structure replaced  $a_B$  by  $a_s$ . This is generally the asymptotic angular eigenvalue for the lowest state above two-body bound states. The mean-field description only contains this effective interaction potential. Two-body structures and bound states in this two-body correlated model is clearly beyond the mean-field.

### 3 Results

With a Gaussian two-body interaction potential of range  $b$  the qualitative features of  $\epsilon_l$  are as shown in figure 1. The large- $l$  features only depend on  $a_s$  and therefore only matters for the model-dependent region at small  $l$  ( $l \approx b < 10^3$  in figure 1). At small and negative scattering length the angular eigenvalue quickly approaches zero as  $1/5N^{7/2} a_s = 0$ . At larger, but still negative, scattering length the angular eigenvalue follows a constant value  $1/6N^{7/3}$  before approaching zero as before. In the case of a bound two-body state, when the scattering length turns positive,  $\epsilon_l$  diverges as  $2^2 = a_s^2$ . Thus a description of two-body bound states is also possible within the model.

The inclusion of the two-body bound state is evident from considering the full spectrum of angular eigenvalues for the case of, e.g., one two-body bound state. In figure 2 we show the two lowest angular eigenvalues in such a case with one two-body bound state and positive scattering length. The lowest eigenvalue (dashed curve) diverges to minus infinity proportional to  $2^2$ . This corresponds to the bound state. The second eigenvalue (solid curve) is negative at small hyperradii but turns positive at larger and approaches the asymptotic behavior  $\epsilon_l / a_s = 0$  (dotted curve, see inset).

The deviations of this method from the mean-field are illustrated in figure 3, where the lowest angular eigenvalue for a case with no two-body bound state and negative scattering length is compared to the zero-range angular eigenvalue for the same scattering length. For low density  $n \lambda_s^3 < 1/N^2$  the effective energy of the two methods coincide, for larger densities the mean-field energy diverges, while the energy from the finite-range model remains finite. Moreover, it deviates




Figure 1. The angular eigenvalue for  $N = 1000$  and a Gaussian interaction potential of range  $b$ . The hyperradius is in units of  $b$  and the two-body s-wave scattering lengths  $a_s$  is indicated as  $a_s = b$  on the plot.




Figure 2. The two lowest angular eigenvalues (dashed and solid curves) for  $N = 100$ ,  $a_s = b = +10$ , and one bound two-body state. The dotted curve is for the same scattering length.

in a region where the density is still relatively low  $n \lambda_s^3 < 1$  so higher-order correlations (especially three-body) do not play a role yet.

A direct comparison of the interaction energy is done by calculating the interaction energy per particle for the zero-range mean-field and for this finite-range model with correlations, see figure 4. The solid curve shows the GPE interaction energy, which increases in magnitude until there is no stable system for  $N \lambda_s^3 b_0 > 0.55$ . The crosses are the results from this finite-range correlated model, which almost coincide with the GPE results. Setting the barrier height of the radial potential with  $V = 1$  equal to the oscillator energy yields the stability criterium  $N \lambda_s^3 b_0 < 0.53$ , which agrees well with the above. The dashed curve is the result for the mean-field with a scattering length equal to the Born-approximation of the finite-range Gaussian we used in the calculation. The deviation of the two GPE calculations, is equivalent to the observation that the mean-field model with a zero-range interaction gives the correct result, but




Figure 3. The lowest eigenvalue for  $a_s = b = 10^4$ ,  $N = 100$ , and no bound two-body states (solid). The dashed curve is for the same scattering length. The vertical lines indicate regions of different density.

not with a finite-range interaction. However, the correlated model reproduces the correct interaction energy with a finite-range interaction of the true scattering length. We interpret this as a confirmation that the crucial degrees of freedom are included in the ansatz for the wave function.




Figure 4. Interaction energy per particle for  $b_L = b = 1442$ ,  $a_s = b = 0.84$  ( $a_B = b = 0.5$ ) calculated by the GPE (solid line) and the two-body correlated method (crosses). The dashed line is the GPE calculation with  $a_s = a_B = 0.5b$ .

#### 4 Conclusion

We presented the key results of a hyperspherical study of two-body correlations in BEC. We confirmed the stability criterium. Moreover, structure beyond the mean-field is observed due to the description of two-body bound states and the effective energy at larger densities. We expect this model in the future allows more detailed analysis of the coupling between molecular BEC and atomic BEC.

A possible extension is the inclusion of the important three-body correlations for a study of the recombination process in dilute atomic medium.

## References

1. M. H. Anderson et al., *Science* 269, 198 (1995). C. C. Bradley, C. A. Sackett, J. J. Tollett, and R. G. Hulet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75, 1687 (1995). K. B. Davis et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75, 3969 (1995).
2. E. A. Donley et al., *Nature (London)* 412, 295 (2001).
3. E. A. Donley, N. R. Claussen, S. T. Thompson, and C. E. Wieman, *Nature (London)* 417, 529 (2002).
4. N. R. Claussen et al., *Phys. Rev. A* 67, 060701 (2003).
5. C. J. Pethick and H. Smith, *Bose-Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001).
6. L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, *Bose-Einstein Condensation* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2003).
7. A. Gammal, T. Frederico, and L. Tomio, *Phys. Rev. A* 64, 055602 (2001).
8. S. Kokkeimans and M. Holland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 180401 (2002).
9. S. Cowell et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 210403 (2002).
10. W. Krauth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 3695 (1996).
11. E. Cerboneschi, C. Menchini, and E. Arimondo, *Phys. Rev. A* 62, 013606 (2000).
12. D. Blume and C. H. Greene, *Phys. Rev. A* 63, 063601 (2001).
13. G. A. Strakharchik, D. Blume, S. Giorgini, and B. Granger, e-print cond-mat/0308585.
14. J. L. Bohn, B. D. Esry, and C. H. Greene, *Phys. Rev. A* 58, 584 (1998).
15. O. S. Sørensen, D. V. Fedorov, and A. S. Jensen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 173002 (2002); *Phys. Rev. A* 66, 032507 (2002).
16. O. S. Sørensen, D. V. Fedorov, and A. S. Jensen, e-print cond-mat/0305040, accepted for *Phys. Rev. A*; cond-mat/0306564, submitted to *J. Phys. B*.