M odulational instability criteria for two-component Bose { E instein condensates

I. Kourakis^{1;y}, P. K. Shukla^{1;2;z}, M. Marklund² and L. Sten o²

 $^{1}\,$ Institut fur Theoretische Physik IV, Fakultat fur Physik und Astronom ie,

Ruhr{Universitat Bochum , D-44780 Bochum , Germany

² Departm ent of Physics, Um a University, SE-90187 Um a, Sweden

(D ated: Subm itted 13 A pril 2005; revised 12 M ay 2005)

The stability of colliding Bose-Einstein condensates is investigated. A set of coupled G ross-P itaevskii equations is thus considered, and analyzed via a perturbative approach. No assumption is made on the signs (or magnitudes) of the relevant parameters like the scattering lengths and the coupling coe cients. The formalism is therefore valid for asymmetric as well as symmetric coupled condensate wave states. A new set of explicit criteria is derived and analyzed. An extended instability region, in addition to an enhanced instability growth rate is predicted for unstable two component bosons, as compared to the individual (uncoupled) state.

PACS num bers: 03.75 Lm, 05.45.-a, 67.40 V s, 67.57 D e K eyw ords: B ose E instein C ondensation, M odulational Instability, G ross P itaevskii E quations.

I. IN TRODUCTION

Bose-E instein condensation of dilute gases in traps has attracted a great deal of interest recently, as witnessed in recent reviews and monographs [1, 2]. Mean-eld theory provides a consistent fram ework for the modeling of the principal characteristics of condensation and elucidates the role of the interactions between the particles. A generic theoreticalm odelw idely em ployed involves the G ross-P itaevskiiequation, which bears the form of a nonlinear Schrodinger-type equation, taking into account boson interactions (related to a scattering length a), in addition to the con nem ent potential in posed on the Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs) in a potential trap. The scattering length a, although initially taken to be positive (accounting for repulsive interactions and prescribing condensate stability), has later been sign-inverted to negative (attractive interaction) via Feshbach resonance, in appropriately designed experiments. This allowed for the prediction of BEC state instability, eventually leading to wave collapse, which is only possible in the attractive case (a < 0) [1]. A sexpected from previous know-how on problem sm odelled by generic nonlinear Schrodinger-type equations (in one or more dimensions), the analysis of BEC dynamics revealed the possibility for the existence of collective excitations including bright- (for a < 0) and dark- (holes, for a > 0) type envelope excitations, as well as vortices, which were quite recently observed in laboratories [3, 4, 5, 9]. The evolution of coupled (\colliding") BEC wavepackets was recently considered in theoretical and experim ental investigations [6, 7, 8]. Pairs of nonlinearly coupled BECs are thus modeled via coupled G ross-P itaevskii equations, involving extra coupling term swhoæ sign and/orm agnitude are a priorinot prescribed. A lthough theoretical modeling, quite naturally, rst involved sym metric pairs of (identical) BECs, for sim plicity, evidence from experiments suggests that asym metric boson pairs deærve attention [9].

In this paper, we investigate the stability of a nonlinearly coupled BEC pair, from stprinciples. Both BECs are assumed to lie in the ground state, for simplicity, although no other assumption is made on the sign and/or magnitude of relevant physical parameters. We shall derive a set of general criteria for the stability of BEC pairs (allowing for asymmetry in the wave functions).

II. THE FORMALISM

The wave-functions $_1$ and $_2$ of two nonlinearly interacting BECs evolve according to the coupled G ross-P itaevskii equations (CGPEs)

$$ih\frac{\theta_{1}}{\theta_{t}} + \frac{h^{2}}{2m_{1}}r^{2} + V_{11}j_{1}j_{1} + V_{12}j_{2}j_{1} + 1 = 0;$$

$$ih\frac{\theta_{2}}{\theta_{t}} + \frac{h^{2}}{2m_{2}}r^{2} + V_{22}j_{2}j_{2} + V_{21}j_{1}j_{2} + 2 = 0;$$
(1)

where $r^2 = (e^2 = e^2 + e^2 = e^2 + e^2 = e^2 = e^2$ is the Laplace operator (a three-dimensional Cartesian geometry is considered, for clarity). Here m_j represents the mass of the jth condensate. A coording to standard theory, the nonlinearity coe cients V_{jj} are proportional to the scattering lengths a_j via V_{jj} = 4 ha_j=m_j, while the coupling coe cients V_{j1} are related to the mutual interaction scattering lengths a_{j1} via V_{j1} = 2 ha_{j1}=m_{j1}, where m_{j1} = m_jm₁=(m_j+m₁) is the reduced m ass. The (linear) last terms in each equation involve the chemical potential j, which corresponds to a ground state of the condensate, in a simpli ed model. These terms may readily be

Subm itted to European Physics Journal B .

^yE lectronic address: ioannis@tp4.rub.de ;

http://www.tp4.rub.de/ ioannis.

^zE lectronic address: ps@tp4.rub.de ;

http://www.tp4.rub.de/ ps.

eliminated via a simple phase-shift transformation, viz. $j = {}^{0}_{j} \exp(i_{j}t) (j = 1;2)$; this is how ever deliberately not done at this stage, for generality. Nevertheless, one therefore intuitively expects no major in uence of the chemical potentials on the coupled BEC dynamics (at least for the physical problem studied here).

III. LINEAR STABILITY ANALYSIS

We shall seek an equilibrium state in the form $_{j} = _{j0} \exp [i'_{j}(t)]$, where $_{j0}$ is a (constant real) am plitude and $'_{j}(t)$ is a (real) phase, into the CGP Eqs. (1). We then nd a monochrom atic (xed-frequency) Stokes' wave solution in the form : $'_{j}(t) = _{j0}t$, where

$$_{j0} = \frac{V_{jj}}{h} \frac{2}{j0} \frac{V_{j1}}{h} \frac{2}{10} + j;$$

forj€ l= 1;2.

Let us consider a small perturbation around the stationary state de ned above by taking $i_{1} = (i_{10} + i_{10})$

 $_{j1}$) exp[i'_j(t)], where $_{j1}$ (r;t) is a complex num ber denoting the sm all (1) perturbation of the slow ly varying modulated bosonic wave-functions (it includes both am plitude and phase corrections), and '_j(t) is the phasor de ned above. Substituting into Eqs. (1) and separating into real and in aginary parts by writing $_{j1} = a_j + ib_j$, the rst order term s (in) yield

$$h \frac{\partial b_{j}}{\partial t} + \frac{h^{2}}{2m_{j}} r^{2} a_{j} \qquad 2V_{jj} \frac{2}{10} a_{j} \qquad 2V_{j1 \ j0 \ 10} a_{1} = 0;$$
$$h \frac{\partial a_{j}}{\partial t} + \frac{h^{2}}{2m_{j}} r^{2} b_{j} = 0; \quad (2)$$

where j and l(j) = 1;2 (this will be henceforth understood unless otherwise stated). E liminating b_j , these equations yield

$$h^{2} \frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta t^{2}} + \frac{h^{2}}{2m_{1}} \frac{h^{2}}{2m_{1}} r^{2} = 2V_{11} \frac{2}{10} r^{2} a_{1}$$
$$\frac{h^{2}}{m_{1}} V_{12} j_{10} j_{20} jr^{2} a_{2} = 0; \qquad (3)$$

(together with a sym m etric equation, obtained by permuting 1 \$ 2). We now let $a_j = a_{j0} \exp[i(k r_kt)]$ + com plex conjugate, where k and k are the wavevector and the frequency of the modulation, respectively, viz. @=@t! i k and $@=@x_n !$ ik_n (x_n fx;y;zg for n = 1;2;3) i.e. $@^2=@t^2 ! 2_k^2$ and $r^2 ! k^2$. A fler som e algebra, we obtain the eigenvalue problem : M a = (h!)^2a, where a = (a_1;a_2)^T, and the m atrix elements are given by M _{jj} = e_j(e_j + 2V_{jj} j_{j0} f) h² 2/j and M _{j1} = 2e_jV_{j1} j_{j0} jj ₁₀ j h² 2/j; where we have de ned e_j = h²k²=2m j. The frequency ! and the wave num ber k are therefore related by the dispersion relation

where the coupling is expressed via ${}_{c}^{4} = {}_{12}^{2} {}_{21}^{2}$ M₁₂M₂₁=h⁴ in the right-hand side of Eq. (4). We stress that this dispersion relation (which is independent of the chem ical potentials _j) relies on absolutely no assum ption on the sign or the magnitude of m_j, V_{jj} and V_{j1}.

IV. MODULATIONAL INSTABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL BECS

In the vanishing coupling limit, i.e. for V_{j1} ! 0, the dispersion relation (4) gives $k_i = j$ (j = 1;2). Absolute stability is ensured if $V_{jj} > 0$. On the other hand, if $V_{jj} < 0$, a purely growing unstable mode occurs (viz. $k_k^2 < 0$) for wavenumbers below a critical value $k_{j,cr} = 2 \text{ (m }_j y_{jj} y^{1=2} j_{j0} j + h$. The growth rate $k_{j,cr} = 2 \text{ (m }_j y_{jj} y^{1=2} j_{j0} j + h$. The growth rate $k_{j,cr} = 2 \text{ (m }_j y_{j0} j + h$. The growth rate $k_{j,cr} = 2 \text{ (m }_j y_{j0} j + h$.

Recalling the de nitions of V_{jj} , we see that a repulsive/attractive scattering length (i.e. positive/negative V_{jj}) prescribes a stable/unstable (single) BEC behavior. In the following, we shall see how this simple criterion for stability ($V_{jj} > 0$) is modiled by the presence of interaction between two he condensates.

V. MODULATIONAL INSTABILITY OF COUPLED BECS

The dispersion relation (4) takes the form of a biquadratic polynom ial equation

$$T_{k}^{2} + D = 0;$$
 (5)

(6)

where $T = TrM = h^2$ $\frac{2}{1} + \frac{2}{2}$ and $D = DetM = h^4$ $\frac{2}{1} \frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{2}{12}$ $\frac{2}{21}$ are related to the trace and the determinant, respectively, of the matrix M . Eq. (5) has the solution

 ${}^2_k = \frac{1}{2} T$ (T² 4D)¹⁼²;

or

$${}^{2}_{k;} = \frac{1}{2} \left({}^{2}_{1} + {}^{2}_{2} \right) \frac{1}{2} \left({}^{2}_{1} - {}^{2}_{2} \right)^{2} + 4 {}^{4}_{c} {}^{1=2} :$$
 (7)

W e note that the right-hand side is real/com plex if the discrim inant quantity = T 2 4D is positive/negative, respectively.

Stability is ensured (for any wavenumber k) if (and only if) both solutions ${}^2_{k;}$ are positive. This is tantamount to the following requirements being satis ed simultaneously: T > 0, D > 0 and > 0. Since the three quantities T, D and are all even order polynomials of k, one has to investigate three distinct polynomial inequalities. The stepstones of the analysis will be outlined in the following, though trying to avoid burdening the presentation with unnecessary details.

 $\begin{array}{c} P \\ P \\ i \\ V_{jj} \\ j \\ j^{2} = m_{j} \end{array}$ (1=m²_j) + $\begin{array}{c} P \\ i \\ V_{jj} \\ j \\ j^{2} = m_{j} \end{array}$ (see de nitions above) depends on (the sign of) the quantity $P_j V_{jj} j_{j0} j = m_j$ which has to be positive for all k, in order for stability to be ensured (for any j_{10} and k). This requires that

$$V_{11} > 0$$
 and $V_{22} > 0$: (8)

O therw ise, T becomes negative (viz. $k_{\dot{p}}^2 < 0$, at least) for k below a critical value $k_{cr;1} = K_{1}$, where $K_{1} = 4 \left({}_{j}V_{jj}j_{j0}j_{=}^2m_{j}\right) = h^2 \left[{}_{j}(1=m_{j}^2) \right] > 0$ (cf. the single BEC criterion above); this is always possible for a su ciently large perturbation amplitude j ${}_{10}j$ if, say, $V_{11} < 0$ (even if $V_{22} > 0$). Therefore, only a pair of two repulsive type BECs can be stable; the presence of one attractive BEC m ay de-stabilize its counterpart (even if the latter would be individually stable).

Second, D = ${}^2_1 {}^2_2 {}^2_{12} {}^2_{21}$ is an 8th-orderpolynom ial in k, which can be factorized as D k⁴ (k⁴ + bk² + c), where b = 4 ${}^j_j (m_j V_{jj}) = h^2$ and c = $16m_1m_2 (V_{11}V_{22} V_{12}V_{21}) j_{10} j^2 j_{20} j^2 = h^4$ (note that b² 4c > 0). The stability requirements b > 0 and c > 0 (in order for D to be positive for any value of k > 0) amount to $m_1V_{11} + m_2V_{22} > 0$ and

$$V_{11}V_{22} \quad V_{12}V_{21} > 0;$$
 (9)

respectively. Only the latter condition for stability has to be retained, since the form errone is autom atically covered by (8) above. To be speci c, solving D = 0 for $k^2 = K_{2;}$, viz. $K_{2;} = [b (b 4c)^{1=2}]=2$, we see that: (i) if b < 0 < c, then $0 < K_{2;} < K_{2;+}$, and D < 0 for $P \frac{1}{K_{2;+}} < k < \frac{P}{K_{2;+}}$ (instability for short wavelengths); (ii) if c < 0 (regardless of b), then $K_{2;} < 0 < K_{2;+}$, and D < 0 for 0 < 0 for $0 < k < \frac{P}{K_{2;+}}$;

(iii) if b > 0 and c > 0, then K_{2} ; $< K_{2}$; < 0, so that D > 0.

W e see that this kind of instability, { i.e. if the criterion (9) is not m et, is due to the mutual interaction potential V_{j1} among the bosons.

Finally, the positivity of = T² 4D = $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}^2 + 4 \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 12 & 21 \end{pmatrix}$ is only ensured (for every value of k and j j0) if $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 12 & 21 \end{pmatrix}$ M₁₂M₂₁ > 0, i.e. if

$$V_{12}V_{21} > 0$$
: (10)

If this condition is not met, the solution (6) above has a nite imaginary part, which accounts for amplitude instability due to the external perturbation. For rigour, we note that bears the form = k⁴ ($c_4 k^4$ gk² + c_0) (where $c_4 > 0$; the complex expressions for c_n are om itted). If 0 c_2^2 4gc₄ $V_2V_{21} < 0$, i.e. if (10) is met, then > 0 for any value of k. If ${}^0 > 0$, on the other hand, denoting K₃; = [c_2 (c_2^2 4gc₄)¹⁼²]=(2c₄), we nd that:

(i) stability is only ensured (since K $_3$; < K $_{3,+}$ < 0 < k^2) if c_2 < 0 < c_0 (nevertheless, this condition depends on

the perturbation amplitudes j $_{\rm j0}$ jand m ay always be violated).

(ii) Again, a nite unstable wavenumber interval k 2 ($K_{3;}$; $K_{3;+}$) is obtained for $c_2 > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$. (iii) Finally, instability will be observed for k 2 (0; $K_{3;+}$) if $c_0 < 0$ (regardless of c_2).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Sum m arizing, we have derived a set of explicit criteria, (8) to (10) above, which should all be satis ed in order for a boson pair to be stable. Therefore, an interacting BEC pair is stable only if the interaction potentials satisfy $V_{11} > 0$ and $V_{22} > 0$ and $V_{11}V_{22} > V_{12}V_{21} > 0$. If one criterion is not m et, then the perturbation frequency develops a nite in aginary part and the solution blow s up in time. A few comments and qualitative conclusions should how ever be m entioned.

First, for a symmetric stable boson pair, viz. $V_{11} = V_{22} > 0$ and $V_{12} = V_{21}$, stability is ensured if $V_{12}^2 < V_{11}^2$. Second, if one BEC satis es $V_{jj} < 0$, the pair will be unstable: only pairs consisting of stable bosons can be stable. Interestingly, in the case of individually unstable BECs (viz. $V_{jj} < 0$, for j = 1 or 2), the instability characteristics are strongly modiled. For instance, in the case of a symmetric unstable boson pair (viz. $V_{11} = V_{22} < 0$ and $m_1 = m_2$), an extended unstable wavenum ber region and an enhanced grow th rate can be obtained, as can be checked via a tedious calculation; cf. Fig. 1. Furthermore, we have pointed out the appearance of secondary instability \windows", i.e. unstable wave num ber intervals beyond ($k_{cr}; k_{cr}^c$), where $k_{cr} \notin 0$.

These results above follow from a set of explicit stability criteria. Both BEC swere assumed to lie in the ground state, for sim plicity, although no other assumption was m ade on the sign and/orm agnitude of the relevant physical parameters. Naturally, a future extension of this work should consider the external con nem ent potential, im posed on the trapped condensates. Our results can be tested, and can hopefully be con rm ed, by designed experiments.

A cknow ledgm ents

IK .is grateful to the M ax-P lanck-Institut fur extraterrestrische P hysik (G arching, G em any) for the aw ard of a fellow ship (project: C om plex P lasm as). Partial support from the D eutsche Forschungsgem einschaft through the Sonderforschungsbereich (SFB) 591 { U niverselles Verhalten G leichgew ichtsferner P lasm en: H eizung, Transport und Strukturbildung is also gratefully acknow ledged.



FIG.1: The growth rate versus the wavenum berk (in units of \dot{y}_{jj} $\dot{j}_{j,0}$ \dot{f} =h and $2m_{j}\dot{y}_{jj}$ $\dot{j}_{j,0}$ \dot{j} =h, respectively) for a symmetric pair of coupled unstable ($V_{j1} < 0$ for j;1 = 1;2) BECs (upper curve) as compared to the single BEC case (low er curve).

- [L] C. Pethick and H. Smith, Bose-Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases, Cambridge U. Press, 2001.
- [2] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, Bose-Einstein Condensation, Oxford U. Press, New York, 2003.
- [3] J.Denschlag et al., Science 287, 97 (2000).
- $[4]\ {\tt K}\ {\tt E}$. Strecker et al., N ature 417, 150 (2002).
- [5] L.Khaykovich et al., Science 296, 1290 (2002).
- [6] E.Timmermans, Phys.Rev.Lett. 81, 5718 (1998).
- [7] D.J.Heinzen et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 84, 5029 (2000).
- [8] Y.B.Band et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 84, 5462 (2000).
- [9] C.J.M yatt, Science 294, 1320 (2001).