Statics, D ynam ics and M an ipulations of B right M atter-W ave Solitons in O ptical Lattices

P.G. Kevrekidis¹, D.J. Frantzeskakis², R. Carretero-Gonzalez³, B.A. Malomed⁴, G. Herring¹ and A.R. Bishop⁵

¹ Departm ent of M athem atics and Statistics, University of M assachusetts, Am herst M A 01003-4515, USA

² Departm ent of Physics, University of Athens, Panepistim iopolis, Zografos, Athens 15784, G reece

³ Nonlinear Dynamical System s G roup, Department of M athematics and Statistics,

⁴ Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, Faculty of Engineering, TelAviv University, TelAviv 69978, Israel

Center for Nonlinear Studies and Theoretical Division,

Los A lam os National Laboratory, Los A lam os, NM 87545, USA

(D ated: In P ress P hys. R ev. A, 2005)

M otivated by recent experimental achievement in the work with Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs), we consider bright matter-wave solitons, in the presence of a parabolic magnetic trap and a spatially periodic optical lattice (OL), in the attractive BEC.We examine pinned states of the soliton and their stability by m eans of perturbation theory. The analytical predictions are found to be in good agreement with numerical simulations. We then explore possibilities to use a time modulated OL as a means of stopping and trapping a moving soliton, and of transferring an initially stationary soliton to a prescribed position by a moving OL.We also study the emission of radiation from the soliton moving across the combined magnetic trap and OL.We nd that the soliton moves freely (without radiation) across a weak lattice, but su ers strong loss for stronger OLs.

I. IN TRODUCTION

The recent progress in experimental and theoretical studies of B ose-E instein condensates (BEC s) [1] has led to an increase of interest in matter-wave (MW) solitons. One-dimensional (ID) dark [2] and bright [3] solitons have been observed in experiments with repulsive and attractive BEC s, respectively. Very recently, bright solitons of the gap type, predicted in repulsive condensates [4], have been created in the experiment [5]. Theoretical predictions concerning a possibility of the existence of stable multi-dimensional [7] optical lattice (OL) have also been reported. The OL is created as a standing-wave interference pattern between mutually coherent laser beam s [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13].

The study of the MW solitons, apart from being a fundam entally interesting topic, may have in portant applications. In particular, a soliton may be transferred and manipulated similarly to what has been recently dem onstrated, experimentally and theoretically, for BECs in magnetic waveguides [14] and atom chips [15]. More generally, the similarity between bosonic MWs and light waves suggests that numerous results known for optical solitons [16], along with the possibility of manipulation of atom ic states (by means of resonant electromagnetic waves governing transitions between di erent states), may have impact on the rapidly evolving eld of quantum atom optics (see, e.g., Ref. [17]).

A context where the dynam ics of MW solitons is particularly interesting is that of BECs trapped in a periodic potential induced by the above-mentioned OLs. The possibility to control the OL has led to the realization of m any interesting phenom ena, including B loch oscillations [10, 18], Landau-Zenertunneling [8] (in the presence of an additional linear external potential), and classical [19] and quantum [13] super uid-insulator transitions. A large am ount of theoretical work has been already done for nonlinear MW s trapped in OLs (see Refs. [20, 21] for recent review s).

The objective of this work is to system atically study the statics and dynam ics of one-dimensional (1D) bright MW solitons con ned in the combination of the parabolic magnetic trap (MT) and OL. Additionally, we exam ine the possibility to control the motion of the soliton by means of a time-dependent OL potential (the latter is available for the experim ent). In particular, we will show that, in the case when the OL period is comparable to the characteristic spatial width of the soliton, it is possible to: (a) snare and imm obilize an originally moving soliton in a local potential well, by adiabatically switching the OL on, and (b) grasp and drag an initially stationary soliton by a slow ly moving OL, delivering it to a desired location. Note that bright MW solitons m ay travel long distances in the real experiment, up to several millimeters $[\beta]$, and are truly robust objects, being them selves coherent condensates. Thus, the manipulation of bright MW solitons is a very relevant issue for the physics of BECs.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the m odel and present analytical results. In Sec. III, we num erically investigate static and dynam ical properties of the solitons, and study possibilities to m an ipulate them as outlined above. The results of the work are sum m arized in Sec. IV.

II. THE MODEL AND ITS ANALYTICAL CONSIDERATION

The Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE), which governs the evolution of the single-atom wave function in the

San Diego State University, San Diego CA, 92182-7720, USA, http://nlds.sdsu.edu/

m ean-eld approximation, takes its fundamental form in the 3D case. A number of works analyze its reduction to an elective 1D equation in the case of strongly elongated cigar-shaped BECs [2, 23, 24]. In particular, the derivation in Ref. [23] assumed that the potential energy ism uch larger than the transverse kinetic energy. A general conclusion is that the elective equation reduces to the straightforward 1D version of the GPE. In the norm alized form, it reads [20]

$$iu_t = \frac{1}{2}u_{xx} + gj_1f_u + V(x)u;$$
 (1)

where u(x;t) is the 1D mean-eld wave function (although a di erent version of the 1D GPE, with a nonpolynom ial nonlinearity, is known too [24]). The com bination of the MT and OL potential corresponds to

$$V(x) = \frac{1}{2} {}^{2}x^{2} + V_{0} \sin^{2}(kx):$$
 (2)

In Eq. (1), x is measured in units of the uid heal-ing length = $\sim = \frac{p}{n_0 g_{1D} m}$, where n_0 is the peak density and g_{1D} $g_{3D} = (2 \ l_2^2)$ is the electric 1D interaction strength, obtained upon integrating the 3D interaction strength $g_{3D} = 4 \sim^2 a = m$ in the transverse directions (a is the scattering length, m the atom ic mass, and $l_2 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$ is the transverse harm onic oscillator length, with !? being the transverse-con nem ent frequency). Additionally, t is measured in units of =c(where c = $n_0 g_{1D} = m$ is the Bogoliubov speed of sound), the atom ic density is rescaled by the peak density n_0 , and energy is measured in units of the chemical potential of the system = $g_{1D} n_0$. Accordingly, the dim ensionless param eter ~! $_x=g_{1D} n_0$ (! $_x$ is the conning frequency in the axial direction) determines the m agnetic trap strength, V₀ is the OL strength, while k is the wavenum ber of the OL; the latter, can be controlled by varying the angle between the counter-propagating laser beam s, so that 2 = k = (laser=2) sin(=2) [25].Finally, g = 1 is the renorm alized nonlinear coe cient, which is positive (negative) for a repulsive (attractive) condensate. As we are interested in the ordinary bright MW solitons, which exist in case of attraction, we will x q = 1.

W ithout the external potential (= $V_0 = 0$), Eq. (1) supports bright solution solutions of the form

$$u_{s}(x x_{0}) = \operatorname{sech}[(x x_{0})]\exp \frac{1}{2}i^{2}t;$$
 (3)

where is the soliton's amplitude, and x_0 is the coordinate of its center. Moving solitons can be generated from the zero-velocity one by a Galilean boost.

In the presence of the external potential, the rst issue is to identify stationary positions for the soliton. This issue can be addressed, using an e ective potential for the soliton's central coordinate (see, e.g., Refs. [26] and [27]), which is de ned by the integral

$$V_{e}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) = V(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{j}_{s}(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}_{0})\mathbf{j}_{dx}; \qquad (4)$$

Stationary positions of the soliton correspond to local extrem a of the e ective potential (4). This well-known heuristic result can be rigorously substantiated by m eans of the Lyapunov-Schm idt theory applied to the underlying nonlinear Schrödinger equation [28]. The e ective potential corresponding to the external potential (2), acting on the stationary soliton (3), can be easily evaluated:

$$V_{e}(x_{0}) = {}^{2}x_{0}^{2} V_{0}k\cos(2kx_{0})\cosh \frac{\kappa}{-}$$
: (5)

1_

Notice that, depending on values of the parameters, this potential may have a single extrem um at $x_0 = 0$, or multiple ones.

The stability of the soliton resting at a stationary position can also be analyzed in terms of the e ective potential (4): the position is stable if it corresponds to a potential m inim um. This well-known result can be rigorously derived using the theory of Ref. [29] and reform ulated in Ref. [30] (see also Refs. [31] and [32]). In particular, the curvature of the potential at the stationary position determ ines the key linearization eigenvalue , that m ay cause an instability, bifurcating through the origin of the corresponding spectral plane (this feature is revealed by the heuristic [26] and rigorous [30] analysis). The eigenvalue is easily found to be

$$^{2} = {}^{1=2}V_{e}^{00}(x_{0});$$
 (6)

con m ing that m inim a and m axim a of the e ective potential (4) give rise, respectively, to stable ($^2 < 0$) and unstable ($^2 > 0$) equilibria.

We note in passing (this will be important in what follows) that the minima of the elective potential (4) di er from the minima of the external potential V (x) trapping the atoms. For instance, for $= \frac{P}{2}$, $V_0 = 0.25$ and = 0.1, the rst three minima of V (x) (apart from the one at x = 0) are located at the points x = 3.0789; 6.1587; 9.2356, while them inima of V_e are found at $x_0 = 3.0166$; 6.0247; 9.0089.

W e now turn to num erical results, aim ing to exam ine the validity of the theoretical predictions, as well as to perform dynam ical experim ents using the OL to guide the soliton m otion.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

A. Stability of the solitons

We begin the num erical part by exam ining the steadystate soliton solutions and their stability in the context of Eq. (1). Such solutions are sought for in the form u(x;t) = exp(i t)w(x), which results in the stationary equation,

$$w = (1=2)w_{xx} + w^3 \quad V(x)w:$$
 (7)

To exam ine the linear stability of the solitons, we take a perturbed solution as

$$u(x) = e^{it} w + a(x)e^{i!t} + b(x)e^{i!t}$$
; (8)

where and ! are an in nites in a lam plitude and (generally speaking, com plex) eigenfrequency of the perturbation, and linearize Eq. (1).

Equations (1) and (2), with g = 1 and arbitrary coe cients V₀; and k, possess a scaling invariance, which allows us to x = 1 (hence = 2). It should be noted that, in the absence of the M T (= 0), the soliton's frequency should be chosen so that it belongs to a bandgap in the spectrum of the linearized Eq. (1) with the periodic potential (2), to avoid resonance with linear B loch waves. However, the M T potential with nite m akes this condition intelevant. In principle, it m ight be interesting to investigate how the increase of from zero gradually lifts the condition of the resonance avoidance, but this m ore form all issue is left beyond the scope of the present work.

To estim ate actual physical quantities corresponding to the above normalized values of the parameters, we consider a cigar-shaped ⁷Li condensate containing N ' 10^3 atoms in a trap with $!_x = 2$ 25 Hz and $!_2 = 70!_x$. Then, for a 1D peak density $n_0 = 10^8$ m⁻¹, the parameter in Eq. (2) assumes the value = 0:1, while the time and space units correspond to 0:3 m s and 1:64 m, respectively. These units remain valid for other values of , as one may vary $!_2$ and change $!_x$ accordingly; in this case, other quantities, such as N, also change.

Figure 1 sum marizes our num erical ndings for the stability problem. As expected, the (zeroth-well) solution for the solution pinned at $x_0 = 0$ exists and it is stable for all values of the potential's param eters. We have typically chosen to x = 0.1 and k = 1 (i.e., = 2) and vary V_0 ; however, it has been checked that the results presented below adequately represent the phenom enology for other values of (;k) as well.

The next (rst-well) solution, corresponding to the potentialm inimum closest to $x_0 = 0$, exists for values of the M T strength V_0 smaller than a critical one $V_0^{(cr)}$. W ithin the accuracy of 0.0025, we have found its num erical value to be $V_0^{(cr)} j_{num} = 0.045$, in very good agreem ent with the prediction following from the analytical approximation (5) for the elective potential, which shows that the corresponding potentialm inimum disappears, merging with a maximum, at $V_0^{(cr)} j_{nal} = 0.048$. The corresponding pinned-soliton solution is indeed stable prior to its disappearance, in agreement with the analytical prediction based on Eq. (6).

Similarly, the subsequent (second-well) solution, associated with the next potential minimum (if it exists), is found to disappear (for the same parameters) at $V_0^{(cr)} j_{\text{hum}} = 0.1 \quad 0.0025$, while the analytical approximation (5) yields $V_0^{(cr)} j_{\text{hnal}} = 0.112$. Finally, a similar result was obtained for the third-well solution: $V_0^{(cr)} j_{\text{hum}} = 0.1425 \quad 0.0025$, and $V_0^{(cr)} j_{\text{hnal}} = 0.176$.



FIG. 1: For each of the three sets of the pictures, the left panel shows the continuation of the soliton branch to values near $V_0^{(cr)}$, at which it disappears (for soliton solutions trapped at di erent wells). The right panel shows the solution at the initial and nalpoints of the continuation (and the corresponding potentials). The left panels show the norm of the soliton solution (proportional to the num ber of atom s in the condensate), $P = \int_{1}^{R_{+1}} j_{1}(x) j dx$, and its squared width, $W = P \frac{1}{1} \frac{R_{+1}}{x^2} x^2 j_1(x) f dx, \text{ as a function of the OL strength}$ V₀. The top set of the panels pertains to the zeroth-well solution (the soliton pinned in the central potential well); the solution in the right panel is shown by the solid line for $V_0 = 0.25$, and by the dash-dotted line for $V_0 = 0$. The corresponding potential is shown by the dotted line for $V_0 = 0.25$, and by the dashed line for $V_0 = 0$. Sim ilarly, in the middle set, the solid line (and the dashed one for the potential) correspond to $V_0 = 0.25$, and the dashed-dotted line, together with the dotted one for the potential, correspond to $V_0 = 0.06$ for the rst-well solution [notice that this branch term inates at V₀ 0:045]. Finally, in the bottom set of the panels, the solid line (and the dashed one for the potential) again correspond to $V_0 = 0.25$, while the dashed-dotted line (and the dotted one for the potential) correspond to $V_0 = 0.15$ for the third-well solution [this branch term inates at $V_0 = 0:1425$].

It is quite natural that the discrepancy between the theoretical and the num erical results increases for the higher-well solutions, given that the num erically exact pro le of the pinned soliton gets more distorted under the action of the M T . Notice, for exam ple, the di erence in the am plitude between the soliton in the top panel and in the one in the bottom panel in Fig. 1, which clearly illustrates this e ect.

B. Soliton dynam ics and m anipulations

Having addressed the existence and stability of the solitons, we now proceed to study their possible dynam ical manipulation by means of the OL.First, we exam ine the possibility to trap a soliton using the secondary m in in a in the OL potential. In particular, it is well known that, in the absence of the OL, the soliton in the magnetic trap, when displaced from the center, $x_0 = 0$, executes harm onic oscillations with the frequency , as a consequence of the Ehrenfest theorem (alias the Kohn's theorem [33], which states that the motion of the center of m ass of a cloud of particles trapped in a parabolic potential decouples from the internal excitations). This result can also be obtained using the variational approxim ation [34] and, more generally, is one of the results obtained from the moment equations for the condensate in the parabolic potential [35].



FIG. 2: (color online) An example of snaring the originally moving soliton using the optical lattice. The left panel shows the motion of the soliton's center of mass. The dashed line shows the situation without the OL (but in the presence of the magnetic trap). If we turn on the OL potential, as the soliton arrives at the turning point of its trajectory, it gets captured by the secondary minimum of the full potential, created in a vicinity of this point. The right panel shows the same, but through the space-time contour plots of the local density, ju (x;t) \hat{f} .

A new issue is whether one can capture the soliton performing such oscillations by turning on the OL.Focusing, as previously, on the most relevant case when the width of the soliton is comparable to the OL wavelength, we display an example of the capture in Fig. 2. The dashed and solid lines show, respectively, the harm onic oscillations in the absence of the OL, and a numerical experiment, where, at the moment when the soliton arrives at the turning point (it is x = 3 for this case, i.e., the third potential minimum), we abruptly turn on the OL, so that

$$V(x;t) = \frac{1}{2} {}^{2}x^{2} + \frac{1}{2}V_{0} 1 + \tanh \frac{t t_{0}}{2} \sin^{2}(kx):$$
(9)

Here t_0 and are constants controlling, respectively, the switch-on time and duration of the process; in the simulations, we use $t_0 = 31.7$ and = 0.1. We clearly observe that, contrary to the large-amplitude oscillations of the soliton taking place when the OL is absent, the soliton is



FIG.3: (color online) Panels have the same meaning as in Fig.2, but now for the case of a moving OL. The left panel shows the soliton's center of mass by the solid line and the motion of the OL's center by the dashed line. The potential V (x;t = 0) is sketched by the dash-dotted line to illustrate the structure and location of the potential wells. The right panel again shows the space-time contour plot of ju(x;t)f. The top set of the panels is generated with $t_0 = 50$ and = 5 in Eq. (9). The second set pertains to $t_0 = 100$ and = 10 (both have $V_0 = 0.25$). The situation for a shallower well, with $V_0 = 0.17$, is shown in the third and fourth panels. In all cases, $x_{ini} = 0$ and $x_n = 3$.

now fully captured (for very long times) by the potential m inim um new ly generated by the optical trap.

Instead of being a m eans to snare for m oving soliton, the O L m ay also be used as a m eans of m oving the soliton in a prescribed way, i.e., as a \robotic arm " depositing the soliton at a desired location (see, e.g., [36]). This possibility is demonstrated (w ith varying levels of success) in Fig. 3. The top two sets of gures are performed for a strong O L ($V_0 = 0.25$), while the bottom two are used for a weaker O L potential (w ith $V_0 = 0.17$). In all the cases the potential used is

$$V(x) = \frac{1}{2} {}^{2}x^{2} + V_{0} \sin^{2} (k(x y(t))); \qquad (10)$$

where the position of the OL is translated according to

$$y(t) = x_{ini} + \frac{1}{2}(x_n - x_{ini}) + tanh - \frac{t - t_0}{2}$$
 : (11)

Here x_{ini} and x_n are, respectively, the initial and nal (target) positions of the soliton. In the case under consideration, $x_{ini} = 0$ and $x_n = 3$, i.e., the aim is to transport the MW soliton from the central well to the third one, on the right of the center. In the top set of the panels with $t_0 = 50$ and = 5, we observe what happens if the motion of the potential center is not su ciently slow to adiabatically transport the soliton to its nalposition. In particular, the soliton gets trapped in the second well, without being able to reach its destination. However, we observe that this di culty can be overcom e, if the transport is applied with a su cient degree of adiabaticity; see, e.g., the middle panel with $t_0 = 100$ and = 10, which succeeds in delivering the soliton at the desired position. Notice that the nalposition of the center of the OL is at y = 3 , which is di erent from the center of the third well of the e ective potential, around which the soliton will oscillate, upon arrival. The theoretical prediction that was presented above (for $V_0 = 0.25$) for this well is $x_0 = 9.0089$, while in the simulations the soliton oscillates around 9:04 in very good agreem ent with the theory. The two lower sets of the panels are meant to illustrate that adiabaticity is not the single condition quaranteeing the e cient transport. The num erical experim ents are perform ed for a shallow er potential w here the relevant well (to which the soliton is to be delivered) is near the threshold of its existence. As a result, neither in the case with = 5 (the third set of panels), nor in the one with = 10, is the OL successful in transporting the soliton at the desired position.

A similar numerical experiment in the absence of the magnetic trap is shown in Fig. 4. The top panels display the successful transfer of the soliton by the OL of a form similar to that in Eq. (9), with = 0 and $V_0 = 0.25$, for $t_0 = 100$ and = 10. Notice that, in the present case, the nalpositions of the OL's center and of the soliton coincide [as the atom ic potential and the elective potential for the soliton have the same set of minima in this case, cf. Eq. (5)]. However, once again, the same experiment, if not performed with a su cient degree of adiabaticity (as in the bottom panel of Fig. 4, with $t_0 = 50$ and = 5), is not successful in depositing the soliton con-

tinues to move along the OL, em itting radiation waves and decreasing its am plitude. To better illustrate the em ission of radiation and its

dependence on the depth of the OL (since it is known that the em ission is absent in the parabolic potential w ithout the OL ingredient), we have also perform ed the following num erical experim ent. We took the potential of the form

$$V(x) = \frac{1}{2} {}^{2}x^{2} + V_{0} \sin^{2}(kx) + (t)x; \qquad (12)$$



FIG. 4: (color online) The same as the previous gure, but with = 0 (i.e., in the absence of the magnetic trap). For $t_0 = 100$ and = 10 (top panels) the soliton is delivered to its nallocation of x $_n = 3$. However, the same is not true for $t_0 = 50$ and = 5 in the bottom panel, where the soliton fails to stop but rather continues its motion, losing more and more of its power through emission of radiation.



FIG.5: M otion of the soliton induced by the linear ram p in Eq. (13) with $t_1 = 100$ and $t_2 = 120$. The top panel shows the case with strong radiation loss in a deep O L ($V_0 = 0.25$); notice apparent friction in the motion of the soliton's center of m ass in the top right panel, and the corresponding loss of the soliton's norm in the panel below it. On the contrary, in the case of the shallow O L, with $V_0 = 0.07$ (the bottom panel), the moving soliton does not generate any visible radiation. In both cases, = 1 was used.

with

(t) = 0:1
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 tanh $\frac{t t_1}{2}$ tanh $\frac{t t_2}{2}$: (13)

In Eq. (13), t_1 and t_2 are, respectively, the initial and nal m om ent of time, between which the linear ramp is applied to accelerate the soliton to a nite propagation speed. We display two such numerical simulations in Fig. 5. The

rst is performed in a deep OL, with $V_0 = 0.25$, taking initially the soliton in the third well ($t_1 = 100$ and $t_2 = 120$ were used). The second simulation was performed in a shallow OL, with $V_0 = 0.07$, the soliton being initially taken in the rst well (the only one existing at such values of the parameters). The top panels clearly show that the emission of radiation leads to the gradual decay of the soliton's amplitude. On the contrary, when the OL is weaker (in the bottom panels), the soliton m oves through it practically without radiation loss.

IV . Conclusion

W e have exam ined a num ber of static and dynam ic features of bright m atter-wave (M W) solitons in the presence of the magnetic trap and optical lattice (O L). W e used the perturbation theory to predict the existence and stability of the M W solitons trapped in the combined potential. A sequence of saddle-node bifurcations of the e ective potential, which lead to consecutive disappearance of the higher-well solitonic bound states with the decrease of the O L strength was predicted, through the disappearance of the potential wells in the e ective potential.

Having identied the stability characteristics of the dif-

ferent wells analytically, and veri ed it num erically, we then explored a possibility to use the OL as a tool to manipulate the soliton. We were able to stop the soliton at a prescribed location by turning on the OL, in an appropriate fashion. We have also found the adiabaticity condition necessary to secure the transfer of the soliton by a moving OL (with and without the magnetic trap). Finally, we have shown the absence of any visible em ission of radiation from the soliton moving across a weak OL; how ever, the soliton loses a large fraction of its norm, m oving through a stronger lattice.

G iven the recent prediction of solitons and vortices in multi-dimensional OL potentials [4] (for recent experimental work on a similar topic in nonlinear optics, see Refs. [37, 38] and references therein), it would be of particular interest to implement similar dragging and manipulation of solitons in higher dimensions. The consideration of this case is currently in progress.

This work was partially supported by NSF-DMS-0204585, NSF-CAREER, and the Eppley Foundation for Research (PGK); the Israel Science Foundation grant No.8006/03 (BAM); and the San D iego State University Foundation (RCG). PGK also gratefully acknow ledges the hospitality of the Center for Nonlinear Studies of the Los A lam os National Laboratory. W ork at Los A lam os is supported by the USD oE.

- [1] F.D alfovo, S.G iorgini, L.P.P itaevskii, and S.Stringari, Rev.M od.Phys.71,463 (1999); A.J.Leggett, ibid.73, 307 (2001); E.A.Comelland C.E.W iem an, ibid.74,875 (2002); W.K etterle, ibid.74,1131 (2002).
- [2] S. Burger, K. Bongs, S. Dettm er, W. Ertm er, K. Sengstock, A. Sanpera, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 5198 (1999); 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); B. P. Anderson, P. C. Haljan, C. A. Regal, D. L. Feder, L. A. Collins, C. W. Clark, and E. A. Cornell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 2926 (2001).
- [3] K.E.Strecker, G.B.Partridge, A.G.Truscott, and R.
 G.Hulet, Nature 417, 150 (2002); L.Khaykovich, F.
 Schreck, G.Ferrari, T.Bourdel, J.Cubizolles, L.D.Carr,
 Y.Castin, and C.Salom on, Science 296, 1290 (2002);
- [4] B.B.Baizakov, V.V.K onotop, and M.Salemo, J.Phys. B 35, 5105 (2002); E A.O strovskaya and Yu.S.K ivshar, Phys.Rev.Lett. 90, 160407 (2003).
- [5] B. Eierm ann, Th. Anker, M. Albiez, M. Taglieber, P. Treutlein, K.-P. Marzlin, and M.K. Oberthaler, Phys. Rev.Lett. 92, 230401 (2004).
- [6] B.B.Baizakov, BA.Malom ed, and M.Salemo, Europhys.Lett. 63, 642 (2003).
- [7] B.B.Baizakov, BA.Malom ed, and M.Salemo, in: Nonlinear W aves: Classical and Quantum Aspects, ed. by FKh.Abdullaev and V.V.Konotop, p. 61 (Kluwer Academ ic Publishers: Dordrecht, 2004); Multidim ensional solitons in a low-dim ensional periodic potential, Phys.

Rev.A, in press.

- [8] B A. Anderson and M A. Kasevich, Science 282, 1686 (1998); M. Jona-Lasinio, O. Morsch, M. Cristiani, N. Malossi, J. H. Muller, E. Courtade, M. Anderlini, and E. Arim ondo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 230406 (2003); V.V. Konotop, P.G. Kevrekidis, and M. Salemo, arX iv cond-mat/0404608.
- [9] C.Orzel, A.K. Tuchman, M.L.Fenselau, M.Yasuda, and M.A.Kasevich, Science 291, 2386 (2001).
- [10] O. Morsch, J.H. Muller, M. Cristiani, D. Ciampini, and E. Arimondo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 140402 (2001).
- [11] F S.C ataliotti, S.Burger, C.Fort, P.M addaloni, F.M inardi, A.Trom bettoni, A.Smerzi, and M. Inguscio, Science 293, 843 (2001).
- [12] M.Greiner, I.Bloch, O.Mandel, T.W. Hansch, and T. Esslinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 160405 (2001).
- [13] M.Greiner, O.Mandel, T.Esslinger, T.W. Hansch, and I.Bloch, Nature (London) 415, 39 (2002).
- [14] A E.Leanhardt, A P.Chikkatur, D.Kielpinski, Y.Shin, T L.Gustavson, W.Ketterle, and D E.Pritchard, Phys. Rev.Lett. 89, 040401 (2002); H.Ott, J.Fortagh, S. Kraff, A.Gunther, D.Komma, and C.Zimmermann, Phys.Rev.Lett.91,040402 (2003);
- [15] W. Hansel, P. Hom melho, T.W. Hansch, and J. Reichel, Nature 413, 498 (2001); R. Folm an and J. Schm iedmayer, Nature 413, 466 (2001); J. Reichel, Appl. Phys. B 74, 469 (2002); R. Folm an, P. K rueger, J. Schm iedmayer, J. Denschlag and C. Henkel, Adv. Atom. Mol. Opt. Phys. 48, 263 (2002).
- [16] Yu S.K ivshar and G P.A graw al, Optical Solitons: From Fibers to Photonic C rystals (A cadem ic Press, San Diego,

- [17] K.M lm er, New J. Phys. 5, 55 (2003).
- [18] D.J.Choiand Q.Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 2022 (1999).
- [19] A. Smerzi, A. Trom bettoni, P.G. Kevrekidis, and A.R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 170402 (2002); F.S. Cataliotti, L. Fallani, F. Ferlaino, C. Fort, P.M. addaloni, M. Inguscio, New J. Phys. 5, 71 (2003).
- [20] P.G. Kevrekidis and D.J. Frantzeskakis, Mod. Phys. Lett. B 18, 173 (2004).
- [21] V A. Brazhnyi and V V. Konotop, M od. Phys. Lett. B 18, 627 (2004).
- [22] V M. Perez-Garc a, H. M ichinel and H. Herrero, Phys. Rev.A 57, 3837 (1998); for a m ore rigorous derivation of the 1D e ective equation (in the case of repulsion, rather than attraction), see a paper by E H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, and J. Yngvason, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 150401 (2003).
- [23] Y B.Band, I.Towers, and B A.M alom ed, Phys. Rev. A 67, 023602 (2003).
- [24] L.Salasnich, A.Parola and L.Reatto, Phys. Rev. A 65, 043614 (2002).
- [25] O. Morsch and E. Arim ondo, in Dynam ics and Thermodynam ics of Systems with Long-Range Interactions, T. Dauxois, S. Ru o, E. Arim ondo and S. Wilkens (Eds.) (Springer, Berlin 2002), pp. 312{331.
- [26] Yu S.K ivshar and B A.M alom ed, Rev. M od. Phys. 61, 763 (1989).
- [27] R.Scharfand A.R.Bishop, Phys. Rev. E 47, 1375 (1993).

- [28] T.Kapitula, Physica D 156, 186 (2001).
- [29] M.Grillakis, J. Shatah and W. Strauss, J. Funct. Anal. 74, 160 (1987); ibid. 94, 308 (1990).
- [30] T.Kapitula, P.G.Kevrekidis and B.Sandstede, Physica D, 195, 263 (2004).
- [31] D E. Pelinovsky, Inertial law for spectral stability of solitary waves in coupled nonlinear Schrodinger equations, preprint (2003).
- [32] Y.-J.Oh, Comm. M ath. Phys. 121, 11 (1989); J.Di. Eq. 81.255 (1989).
- [33] W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. 123, 1242 (1961); JF. Dobson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 2244 (1994).
- [34] U.AlKhawaja, H.T.C.Stoof, R.G.Hulet, K.E.Strecker, and G.B.Partridge, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 200404 (2002).
- [35] J.J. G arcia-R ipoll and V M . Perez-G arcia, arX iv: pattsol/9904006.
- [36] H E. Nistazakis, P.G. Kevrekidis, B A. Malomed, D J. Frantzeskakis, and A R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. E 66, 015601 (R) (2002).
- [37] D N. Neshev, T J. A lexander, E A. O strovskaya, Yu.S. Kivshar, H. Martin, I. Makasyuk, and Z. Chen, Phys. Rev.Lett. 92, 123903 (2004).
- [38] JW. Fleischer, G. Bartal, O. Cohen, O. Manela, M. Segev, J. Hudock, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 123904 (2004).