Interaction broadening of W annier functions and M ott transitions in atom ic BEC

Jinbin Li,¹ Yue Yu,¹ Artem M. Dudarev,^{2,3} and Q ian N iu²

¹ Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100080, China

² Department of Physics, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712–1081, USA

³ M ax-P lanck-Institut fur P hysik kom plexer System e, N othnitzer Str. 38, 01187 D resden, G erm any

(D ated: A ugust 20, 2021)

Super uid to M ott-insulator transitions in atom ic BEC in optical lattices are investigated for the case of number of atom s per site larger than one. To account for mean eld repulsion between the atom s in each well, we construct an orthogonal set of W annier functions. The resulting hopping am - plitude and on-site interaction m ay be substantially di erent from those calculated with single-atom W annier functions. A s illustrations of the approach we consider lattices of various dimensionality and di erent mean occupations. We nd that in three-dimensional optical lattices the correction to the critical lattice depth is signi cant to be measured experimentally even for sm all number of atom s. Finally, we discuss validity of the single band m odel.

PACS num bers: 03.75 H h, 67.40.-w, 32.80 P j, 39.25.+ k

I. IN TRODUCTION

N um erous m any-body phenom ena have been recently dem onstrated with Bose-E instein condensates (BEC) in optical lattices [1, 2, 3]. Number squeezing has been observed with 87 Rb atom s in a one-dimensional lattice of pancake-shaped wells [1], and super uid to M ott-insulator transitions have been witnessed with such atom s in three-dimensional and one-dimensional optical lattices [2]. Such transitions were predicted by theoret-ical studies based on the Bose-Hubbard m odel [4] and by m icroscopic calculations of the m odel parameters for BEC in optical lattices [5, 6].

Very important question is whether it is possible to observe super uid to M ott-insulator transitions for the mean occupation number n larger or even much larger than one? Phenom enological single band Bose-Hubbard m odel indeed predicts such transitions. Previous calculations of the model parameters J, hopping am plitude, and U, on-site interaction, were based on the lowest band W annier functions for a single atom in an optical lattice. Repulsive interaction between the atom s for n > 1 m ay cause the wave function in each well to expand in all directions, not only a ecting the on-site interaction U [7] but also strongly enhancing tunneling J between neighboring wells. This is especially signi cant in lower dim ensional lattices with transverse potential bigger than the lattice wells where large occupations can be achieved without substantial three-body collisional loss. In order to provide theoretical guidance for experim ental observation of M ott transitions in such system s, it is very im portant to obtain accurate critical param eters of the lattice potential for lattice occupations beyond unity.

Here we show how to construct an orthogonal basis ofW annier functions with m ean-eld atom ic interactions taken into account. We use it to obtain renorm alized values of parameters J and U, from which critical depth of the potential V_c is calculated for various lattices of dierent dimensionality and mean occupation. For the cubic optical lattice with n = 2 or larger, our result is no-

ticeably larger than that calculated without taking into account interaction. This increase is more pronounced for the anisotropic cases with stronger lattice potentials in one or two directions. For the case of one-dimensional lattice of pancake-shaped wells [1] or two-dimensional lattice of tubes β], our results are several times larger than critical values calculated from one-atom W annier functions. This is in agreement with the experimental nd-ings that much higher lattice potentials are needed to reach the transition point in such cases.

K ohn developed variational approach to calculate electronic W annier functions in crystals [8]. W e m odify this procedure by m inim izing on-site energy self-consistently taking into account interaction between atom s.

In the last section we address validity of the singleband Bose-Hubbard model constructed with variational W annier functions. The conditions for the model to be valid need to be modi ed from those for a single particle case since the interaction between the particles alters the band structure substantially [9]. For the model to be valid two conditions have to be fulled: (i) when the number of particles in a well changes by one the variational W annier function should not change signi cantly and (ii) collective excitations of the atom s within each well should be less energetically favorable than atom hopping between the wells.

II. BOSE HUBBARD MODEL AND WANN IER FUNCTIONS

For bosonic atom s located in the lattice potential V (r) and described by boson eld operators (r), the H am iltonian eld operator is

$$H = \frac{Z}{dr y(r)} \frac{z^2}{2m}r^2 + V(r) (r) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{4}{m}a_s^2 \frac{Z}{dr y(r) y(r)} (r) (r); (1)$$

where a_s is the atom s' scattering length and m is the mass. To illustrate our methods we use as an example isotropic cubic lattice. We assume that the boson eld operator may be expanded as $(r) = {}_i b_i W (r n_i)$, where b_i is the annihilation operator for an atom in the W annier state of site r_i . Substituting this expansion into the H am iltonian we obtain a problem of lattice bosons. We consider the case when the number of atom s per cite n_i uctuates around average number n. This results in the standard B ose-H ubbard H am iltonian

$$H = \int_{hiji}^{X} b_{j}^{y} b_{j} + \frac{U}{2} \int_{i}^{X} n_{i} (n_{i} - 1) + \int_{i}^{X} n_{i} I; \quad (2)$$

where the e ective on-site repulsion U, the hopping am - plitude J and the on-site single-atom energy I are de ned by

$$U = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial n^2}$$
(3)

$$J = drW (r) \frac{z^{2}}{2m}r^{2} + V(r) W(r+a); (4)$$

$$I = drW (r) \frac{z^2}{2m}r^2 + V(r) W(r);$$
 (5)

where $g = 4 a_s^{2} = m$ and a is the lattice vector. On-site energy f is de ned as

$$f = nI + U_0 n (n \quad 1) = 2;$$
 (6)

with the bare on-site interaction U_0

$$Z U_0 = g dr \mathbf{\hat{y}} (r) \mathbf{j}^4$$
: (7)

W e assumed that the W annier function does not change much for small uctuations of the number of atom s. 0 - site interactions are also neglected.

In case of m ore than one atom per site the presence of other atoms does modify the W annier function of an atom. Below we describe our strategy for its selfconsistent calculation. We start with a trial wave function localized in each well, $g(r = r_i)$. A W annier function corresponding to the low est B loch band m ay be constructed according to K ohn's transform ation:

$$W(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{array}{c} X \\ c_{i}g(\mathbf{r} & \mathbf{r}_{i}); \\ c_{i} = \begin{array}{c} Z \\ \frac{dk}{(2 \)^{3}} \frac{e^{ik \ \mathbf{r}_{i}}}{\mathbf{p} \frac{G(k)}{G(k)}}; \end{array}$$
(8)

where the integral is over the st B rillouin zone and

$$G(k) = \operatorname{drg}(r)g(r r_{i})\cos(k r_{i}) cos(k r_{i}) cos(k$$

For an odd W annier function, the cosine function should be replaced by the sine function. O ne can show that such W annier functions are norm alized and are orthogonal to each other for di erent wells. W e vary the trial function to m inim ize the on-site energy f [10].

W e note that another m ethod to calculate the W annier functions including interaction e ects self-consistently m ay be used for sm all interactions. Starting with nonlinear tim e-independent G ross-P itaevskii equation

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{2m} r^2 (r) + \frac{4 \lambda^2 a_s}{m} j (r) j^2 (r) + V (r) (r) = (k) (r); \quad (10)$$

one m ay calculate periodic B loch states u_k (r) de ned as

$$_{k}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{ik} u_{k}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{N}$$
 (11)

by expanding them in Fourier series

W

$$u_{k}(x) = \bigwedge_{n}^{X} A_{n}^{k} e^{i2n x=a}$$
 (12)

and solving nonlinear system of equations. Then, a set of W annier wave functions for the band in question is de ned by $\$

$$m (r a) = L^{1=2} X m_{;k} (r a)$$
$$= L^{1=2} X m_{;k} (r a)$$
$$= L^{1=2} X m_{;k} (r) e^{ik a} : (13)$$

This procedure fails for large interactions because the bands develop bops and become not single-valued [9].

III. SUPERFLUID TO MOTT-INSULATOR TRANSITIONS

We consider three optical lattice systems which are relevant to experiments: (i) isotropic three-dimensional optical lattice, (ii) anisotropic three-dimensional lattices, and (iii) the situation when the lattice potential is present only in one or two directions and con nement in other directions is provided by relatively weak harm onic trap. Following standard practice, we will use the lattice period =k, atom ic mass m, and recoil energy $E_r = -k^2 k^2 = 2m$ as the basic units.

Three pairs of counter-propagating laser beam s with wavelength 2 =k propagating along three perpendicular directions create potential

$$V(r) = V_x \sin^2 (kx) + V_y \sin^2 (ky) + V_z \sin^2 (kz)$$
: (14)

Isotropic cubic lattice is created by the beam of equal intensity. In this case $V_x = V_y = V_z = V_0$.

A nisotropic cubic lattices can be created by choosing intensity of one or two beam to be much large than other. In this case $V_y = V_z = V_2$, $V_x = V_0$ or $V_z = V_2$, $V_y = V_x = V_0$. Below we study the case when ~!?, where is the chemical potential of the atom s, thus the weak optical lattice is electively one-dimensional or

two-dimensional and transverse motion is frozen to the ground state of the transverse con nement.

Transverse motion can also be decoupled in the experimentally relevant case when the lattice potential is present only in one or two directions and atom s are conned in other directions by relatively weak harmonic trap: V_T (r_2) = $\frac{1}{2}m ! \frac{2}{2} r_2^2$.

A coording to existing experiments, in our calculations through this work, we choose the 87 Rb atoms in F = 2;m = 2 state with scattering length $a_s = 5.8$ nm and the laser wavelength of 852 nm for the three- and two-dimensional lattices and 840 nm for the one-dimensional lattice. A llnumerical results are obtained using 21 lattice wells in each direction with periodic boundary condition. C onvergence has been checked using 41 wells for some of the key results.

In each case we calculate parameters of the Bose-Hubbard model based on the variational approach described in the previous section. The critical condition for super uid to M ott-insulator transition has been found approximately as

$$U = zJ = 2n + 1 + 2^{p} \overline{n(n+1)};$$
 (15)

where z is the number of the nearest neighbor sites [11]. By substituting the parameters into the critical condition, we can map out the critical potential strength as a function of mean occupation.

In the following, we report our ndings for isotropic and anisotropic three-dimensional lattices, one-dimensional lattice of pancake wells, and two-dimensional lattice of tubes.

A. Isotropic cubic lattice

In the case of isotropic cubic lattice we choose variational trial function to be in the form g(r) = g(x)g(y)g(z), with $g(u) = (1 + u^2)e^{u^2 = 2}$, where and

are variational parameters. Then the W annier function m ust also be of the product form W (r) = w (x)w (y)w (z), with the one-dimensional functions w (u) and g (u) related by the one-dimensional version of K ohn's transform ation. All the three-dimensional integrals in Eq. (2)-(15) can then be reduced to one-dimensional ones, greatly simplifying the calculations.

O ur calculations proceed as follow ing. For a given V_0 and n, we start with certain initialparameters and to obtain a trialW annier function through K ohn's transform ation and calculate the on-site energy f. The procedure is repeated by varying the parameters until the on-site energy f is m inimized. The resulting variationalW annier function will depend on both n and V_0 . If only the on-site single-atom energy I is m inimized, one obtains the single-atom W annier function W_0 (r) which only depends on V_0 . We nd that interaction broadens W annier functions, as a result U_{0s} is always larger than U_0 , but we also notice that e ective interaction U can be larger



FIG. 1: Dependence of various interaction parameters on number of atoms for V = $35E_r$. U and U₀ are defined by (3) and (7) respectively. The derivative in (3) is calculated by Chebyshev tting to function f. Interaction parameter U_{0S} calculated with single particle W annier function is defined as U_{0S} = g drjW₀(r)⁴, where W₀(r) is a single-atom W annier function.



FIG. 2: Hopping elements calculated with single particle W annier function, $J_{0s} = drW_0$ (r) $\sim^2 r^2 = 2m + V$ (r) W_0 (r + a), and with the variational proceedure described in the text, J. D epth of the lattice is $V = 35E_r$.

than $U_0 \ (\text{see Fig.1})$. So phase transition is m ore complex than we expected.

Once the W annier function is determined, we can calculate the Bose-Hubbard parameters U and J. In Fig.3, we depict the ratio U=zJ (z = 6) as a function of the mean occupation n for several values of the potential strength V_0 . The decreasing trend can be understood as following. The total interaction energy increases with n, making the W annier function broader, hence the interaction parameter U becomes smaller, J proportional to overlap between neighboring W annier functions becomes larger, and as a result the ratio decreases. The intersection with the line of critical condition (in Fig. 3 the line with positive slope obtained from Eq. (15)) then yields the mean occupation for which these potentials are crit-



FIG.3: The ratio U=zJ versus mean occupation n calculated from the variationalW annier functions for isotropic cubic lattice. For each given parameter V_0 , intersection with the solid line yields the mean occupation number for which the given V_0 is critical { condition in Eq.(15).

ical. For n=1,2,3 and 4, we nd the critical potentials to be $V_c = 11:95;14:32;16:25$ and 18:15 respectively. A similar calculation can be done by using the a singleatom W annier function. The critical potentials become e 11:85;13:47;14:61 and 15:43 for the rst fourm ean occupations. For n = 1, the two results agree with each other within num erical uncertainty [12], and are also consistent with experim entally determ ined range for the critical potential [?]. For n > 1, the mean eld repulsion makes the critical potential noticeably higher. Starting from n = 3 the correction to the critical depth of the lattice has to be clearly observable experim entally and e ects of interaction has to be taken into consideration.

B. A nisotropic cubic lattices

O ur procedure can also be applied to the case of an anisotropic lattice. We model the system as a lower dimensional problem with the reduced interaction parameter g_d obtained by multiplying g by the integral of j₂ d, where 2 is the single-atom ground state wave function in a well of the transverse potential [5]. In the harmonic approximation, the wave function can be found exactly, and the reduced interaction parameter is given by $g_1 = \frac{g}{2} \frac{P}{V_2} \frac{V_2}{V_2}$ for the quasi-one-dimensional lattice. In the calculations discussed below, we take $V_2 = 80E_r$.

To nd the W annier functions for the lower dimensional lattices, we use these reduced interaction parameters in our procedure, replacing all the threedimensional integrals in Eqs. (5) and (5) by lower dimensional ones. The critical lattice potential V_c calculated using such variational W annier functions is depicted in Fig. 4 for the one- and two-dimensional



FIG. 4: The critical lattice potential V_c calculated from the variational and single-atom W annier functions for an isotropic cubic lattices. The lines are guides to eyes. The dashed lines are for the quasi-one-dim ensional and the solid lines are for quasi-two-dim ensional cases. The triangles correspond to the variational and the circles to the single-particle calculations.

models. For comparison, we also include results calculated using the one-atom W annier function. The increase of critical potential due to m ean-eld repulsion on the W annier functions is somewhat bigger in the lower dimensional cases.

C. Lattices in one or two directions

BECs in one-dimensional lattice of pancake-shaped wells and two-dimensional lattice of tube-shaped wells have been studied in experiments [1?]. Because of the large transverse dimensions of such wells, many atoms can be held in a well without su ering too much three-atom collisional loss, opening the possibility of studying super uid/M ott-insulator transition for relatively large n [7, 13]. In a theoretical investigation, O osten et al [7] considered the interaction e ect by using a transverse wave function in the Thom as-Ferm i approximation without modifying the single-atom W annier function in the lattice direction (s). Here we extend their work by considering the interaction e ect on the W annier functions as well.

For the pancake like BEC array, the transverse wave functions are approximated by the Thomas-Ferm i wave function $_{\rm TF}$ (r?) of the BEC within the pancake plane, which is de ned by

$$j_{TF}(r_{?})^{2} = (ng_{1})^{1} (V_{T}(r_{?}));$$
 (16)

for > $V_T(r_2) = \frac{1}{2}m !_2^2 r_2^2$ and vanishes otherwise. According to the experimental data, we take !_2 = 19 2 s¹.



FIG.5: The critical lattice potential V_c in dependence on mean occupation n calculated from the variational (triangle) and single-atom (circle) W annier functions for: (a) the onedimensional lattice with $!_2 = 2$ 19 s¹ (dashed line) and $!_2 = 2$ 120 s¹ (solid line), and (b) two-dimensional lattice with $!_2 = 2$ 24 s¹. The lines are guides to eyes.

W e begin by writing the W annier function in the form, W (r) = w (r_L) (r_?), where is the wave function for the transverse direction (s), and w is the W annier function in the lattice direction (s), both to be determined variationally by m inim izing the on-site energy. The part of the on-site energy involving is just the n-particle G ross-P itaevskii energy in the transverse potential and with the interaction parameter g modied into gd by multiplying the integral of $j_{v}(r_{L})^{4}$. In the Thomas-Ferm i approximation, this transverse energy' is given by $f_2 = \frac{2n}{3} nm ! \frac{2}{2} g_1 = for the one-dimensional case and$ $f_{?} = \frac{5n^{2}}{10} (9m !_{?}^{2} n^{2} g_{2}^{2})^{1=3}$ for the two-dimensional case. The total on-site energy is the sum of this transverse energy' and n times of the single-atom energy of the lattice W annier function:

$$f = f_{?} + n dr_{L} w (r_{L}) \frac{2}{2m} r^{2} + V (r_{L}) w (r_{L}) (17)$$

Lattice W annier function, obtained by the procedure of K ohn's transform ation and m inim ization of the on-site



FIG.6: Energy associated with hopping (process 1) has to be smaller than energy to excite the many-body state in well (process 2). Many-body excitation is schematically depicted as a single atom excitation.

energy, will be a ected by the interaction because the transverse energy' depends on it through the reduced interaction parameter g_d . A fler w (r_L) is determined variationally, the Bose-H ubbard parameters J and U can be calculated immediately. In Fig. 7, we show the critical potential V_c for the case of one-dimensional lattice with transverse trap frequency $!_2 = 2 = 19 \text{ s}^1$ and 120 s^1 .

For comparison, we also show the corresponding results obtained using the single-atom W annier function of the lattice and the Thom as-Ferm i transverse wave function. It is clear that V_c is raised dram atically due to the broadening of the W annier function. In the experiment of Ref. [1], the magnetic trap potential is 19 s 1 . The transverse trap frequency is enhanced to 120 s $^{\rm 1}$ if the optical con ning potential with $V_0 = 50E_r$ is turned on, and the mean occupation number is n 50. Evidence from Bragg interference pattern shows that the critical value of the lattice potential should be som ew hat larger than 44E_r. This observation is contradictory to the prediction based on the single-atom W annier function, but is consistent with our result based on the variational W annier function.

In the case of two-dimensional lattice, our results for the critical lattice potential are shown in Fig. 7 (b) for $!_2 = 2 = 24 \text{ s}^1$ which is used in [?]. We predict V_c 33E_r for n 100, while the single-atom W annier function yields V_c 27E_r. The largest lattice potential used in the experiment was 12 E_r, so further experiment is needed to verify the theoretical predictions.

IV. VALIDITY OF THE SINGLE-BAND MODEL

In this section, we discuss the conditions for the single band Bose Hubbard model to be valid. First, we make general remarks and then give quantitative examples relevant for the case of the isotropic cubic lattice.

A ssum ption that the boson eld operator m ay be expanded as $(r) = {}_{i}b_{i}W$ $(r \ r_{i})$ requires that the W annier functions do not change substantially when the num – ber of atom s in a well changes by one. A good criteria for this condition to be full led is that interaction energy calculated with the W annier function does not change m uch



FIG. 7: Relative change in the interaction energy as number of atom s changes by one determ ined by the change of the W annier wave function.

when number of particles changes by one

$$\frac{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{U}_{n} \quad \mathbf{U}_{n+1}\mathbf{j}}{\mathbf{U}_{n} + \mathbf{U}_{n+1}} \quad 1:$$
(18)

Note that the value of U can still be quite di erent from the one calculated with a single particle W annier function.

W hen the condition is fulled, the second condition is that the excitations within the ansatz have to be the least energetical. That is the hopping of the atoms from well has to be more energetically favorable than excitation of atoms in each well to the many-body excited state (see Fig. 6). If we consider two neighboring wells the energy of the ground state is

$$E_0 = 2nI + U_0 n (n \quad 1)$$
: (19)

The energy associated with hopping is

$$E_1 = 2nI + U_0 \frac{(n - 2)(n - 1) + n(n + 1)}{2}$$
 $E_0 = U_0(20)$

It has to be much smaller than the energy of the st excited many-body state that we denote

We plot the criteria from Eq. (18) for isotropic lattices on Fig. 7. It is much smaller than unity. To estimate the e ect of many-body excitation within a single well, we neglect hopping amplitude J, since close to Mottinsulator transition it is much smaller than atom's interaction. A lso for the experimentally relevant region of the potential depths the potential can be well approximated by a harm onic potential. In the harm onic potential the lowest many-body excited mode is associated with the center of mass motion { Kohn mode [15]. As a result ~!. Since we neglect the tunneling we may start



FIG.8: Ratio of the hopping energy to energy required to excite atom s in each well to the lowest many-body excited state.

directly with variational form for the W annier function in a well. We take W (x;y;z) = W (x)W (y)W (z), where W $(u) = C (1 + u^2)e^{-u^2}$. Sim ilar to previous section for a xed V₀ and n we m inim ize on-site energy f. From the results shown in Fig. 8 it is clear that the single-band m odel is applicable in this case: the energy associated with atom's hopping is much smaller than the energy required to excite the atom s inside of the wells.

The authors thank D an H einzen, Yu-Peng W ang, Shi-Jie Yang and LiYou for the useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation of China, the NSF of the United States, and the W elch Foundation of Texas.

- [1] C. O rzel, A. K. Tuchman, M. L. Fenselau, M. Yasuda and M. A. Kasevich, Science 291, 2386 (2001).
- M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. Esslinger, T. W. Hansch and I. Bloch, Nature 415, 39 (2002) T. Stoferle, H. Moritz, C. Schori, M. Kohl, T. Esslinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 130403 (2004).
- [3] M. Greiner, I. Bloch, O. Mandel, T. W. Hansch and T. Esslinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 160405 (2001);
- [4] M. P.A. Fisher, P.B. Weichman, G.Grinstein, and D. S.Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 40, 546 (1989).
- [5] D. Jaksch, C. Bruder, J. I. Cirac, C.W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3108 (1998).
- [6] J. Javanainen, Phys. Rev. A 60, 4902 (1999).
- [7] D. van Oosten, P. van der Straten, and H. T. C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. A 67, 033606 (2003).
- [8] W .Kohn, Phys. Rev. B 7, 4388 (1973).

- [9] B iao W u and Q ian N iu, N ew Jour. of P hys. 5, 104 (2003).
- [10] A coording to K ohn [8], m in in ization of the on-site energy for non-interacting particles does indeed give the correct W annier functions for the lowest band, provided one starts with a su ciently localized trialwave function of the correct symmetry.
- [11] W .K rauth, M .Ca arel, and J.P.Bouchaud, Phys.Rev. B 45 3137 (1992); K.Sheshadri et al, Europhys.Lett. 22,257 (1993); J.K.Freericks and H.Monien, Europhys. Lett. 26,545 (1994).
- [12] The num erical errors come from optim izing the W annier function, resulting in uncertainty of 0.15 in V_c. The result for n = 1 is slightly lower than that reported in [?

] based on single-atom W annier function obtained from band structure calculations. In principle, our calculation can be m ade m ore precise by using m ore variational param eters in the trial functions (See, [8]).

- [13] A.Polkovnikov, S.Sachdev and S.M.G invin, Phys. Rev. A 66,053607 (2002); E.Altm an and A.Auerbach, Phys. Rev.Lett. 89, 250404 (2003).
- [14] Q ian N iu, M odern Physics Letters B 5, 923 (1991).
- [15] C J. Pethick and H. Sm ith, Bose-E instein Condensation in dilute Gases (C am bridge U niversity P ress, C am bridge, 2002) Ch. 7.