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#### Abstract

The stability of colliding Boseモinstein condensates is investigated. A set of coupled G ross$P$ itaevskii equations is thus considered, and analyzed via a perturbative approach. N o assum ption is $m$ ade on the signs (or $m$ agnitudes) of the relevant param eters like the scattering lengths and the coupling coe cients. T he form alism is therefore valid for asym $m$ etric as $w e l l$ as sym $m$ etric coupled condensate wave states. A new set of explicit criteria is derived and analyzed. A n extended instability region, in addition to an enhanced instability grow th rate is predicted for unstable two com ponent bosons, as com pared to the individual (uncoupled) state.
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## I. IN TRODUCTION

B ose E instein condensation of dilute gases in traps has attracted a great deal of interest recently, as witnessed in recent review $s$ and $m$ onographs $[1,1,1, M$ ean eld theory provides a consistent fram ew ork for the $m$ odeling of the principal characteristics of condensation and elucidates the role of the interactions betw een the particles. A generic theoreticalm odelw idely em ployed involves the G ross $P$ itaevskiiequation, which bears the form ofa nonlinear Schrodinger-type equation, taking into account boson interactions (related to a scattering length a), in addition to the con nem ent potentialim posed on the B ose$E$ instein 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 experim ents. This allow ed for the prediction ofB E C state instability, eventually leading to w ave collapse, which is only possible in the attractive case ( $a<0$ ) [111]. A s expected from previous know how on problem sm odelled by generic nonlinearSchrodinger-type equations (in one or $m$ ore dim ensions), the analysis of BEC dynam ics 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
 (\colliding") BEC wavepäckets was recently considered
 P airs of nonlinearly coupled BEC s are thus m odeled via coupled G ross $P$ itaevskiiequations, involving extra cou-

[^0]pling term $s$ w hose sign and/orm agnitude are a priorinot prescribed. A though theoretical m odeling, quite naturally, rst involved sym $m$ etric pairs of (identical) BEC s, for sim plicity, evidence from experim ents suggests that asym $m$ etric boson pairs deserve attention $[\underline{d}]$.

In this paper, we investigate the stability of a nonlinearly coupled BEC pair, from rst principles. B oth BECs are assum ed to lie in the ground state, for sim plicity, although no other assum ption is $m$ ade on the sign and/or m agnitude of relevant physical param eters. W e shall derive a set of general criteria for the stability ofBEC pairs (allow ing for asym $m$ etry in the $w$ ave functions).

## II. THE FORMALISM

The wave-functions 1 and 2 of two nonlinearly interacting BECs evolve according to the coupled G rossP itaevskiiequations (C G P Es)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { ih } \frac{@ 1}{@ t}+\frac{h^{2}}{2 m_{1}} r^{2} \quad 1 \quad V_{11} j_{1} \jmath^{2} \quad 1 \quad V_{12} \dot{j}_{2}{ }^{2} \quad 1 \\
& i h \frac{@}{@ t}+\frac{h^{2}}{2 m_{2}} r^{2} \quad 2 \quad V_{22} j_{2} J^{2} \quad 2 \quad V_{21} j_{1} J^{2} \quad 2 \\
& +22=0 \text {; } \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $r^{2}=@^{2}=@ x^{2}+@^{2}=@ y^{2}+@^{2}=@ z^{2}$ is the Laplace operator (a three-dim ensionall artesian geom etry is considered, for clarity). H ere $m_{j}$ represents the $m$ ass of the jth condensate. A ccording to standard theory, the nonlinearity coe cients $V_{j j}$ are proportional to the scattering lengths $a_{j}$ via $V_{j j}=4 h_{j}=m_{j}$, while the coupling coe cients $V_{j 1}$ are related to the $m$ utual interaction scattering lengths $a_{j 1}$ via $V_{j 1}=2 h a_{j 1}=m_{j 1}$, where $m_{j 1}=m_{j} m_{l}=\left(m_{j}+m_{1}\right)$ is the reduced $m$ ass. The (linear) last term $s$ in each equation involve the chem icalpotential $j$, which corresponds to a ground state of the condensate, in a sim pli ed m odel. These term $\mathrm{s} m$ ay readily be
elim inated via a sim ple phase-shift transform ation, viz. $j=j_{j}^{0} \exp (i \quad j t)(j=1 ; 2)$; this is how ever deliberately not done at this stage, for generality. N evertheless, one therefore intuitively expects no $m$ ajor in uence of the chem ical potentials on the coupled BEC dynam ics (at least for the physical problem studied here).

## III. LINEAR STABILITY ANALYSIS

We shall seek an equilibrium state in the form $j=$ $j 0 \exp \left[i^{\prime}{ }_{j}(t)\right]$, where $j 0$ is a (constant real) am plitude and ${ }^{\prime}{ }_{j}(t)$ is a (real) phase, into the CGP Eqs. [11]). $W$ e then nd a m onochrom atic ( xed-frequency) Stokes' wave solution in the form : ' ${ }_{j}(t)={ }_{j 0} t$, where

$$
{ }_{j 0}=\frac{V_{j j}}{h}{\underset{j 0}{2} \quad \frac{V_{j l}}{h}{ }_{10}^{2}+j ; ~ ; ~ ; ~}_{h}
$$

for $j \in l=1 ; 2$.
Let us consider a sm all perturbation around the stationary state de ned above by taking $j=(j 0+$
$\left.{ }_{j 1}\right) \exp \left[i^{\prime}{ }_{j}(t)\right]$, where ${ }_{j 1}(r ; t)$ is a com plex num ber denoting the sm all ( $\quad 1$ ) perturbation of the slow ly varying $m$ odulated bosonic $w$ ave-functions (it includes both am plitude and phase corrections), and '_j (t) is the phasor de ned above. Substituting into Eqs. (III) and separating into real and im aginary parts by writing $j 1=a_{j}+i b_{j}$, the rst order term $s$ (in ) yield

$$
\begin{array}{r}
h \frac{@ b_{j}}{\varrho t}+\frac{h^{2}}{2 m_{j}} r^{2} a_{j} \quad 2 V_{j j} \\
{ }_{10}^{2} a_{j} \quad 2 V_{j 1} \text { j0 } 10 a_{1}=0 ;  \tag{2}\\
\\
h \frac{@ a_{j}}{@ t}+\frac{h^{2}}{2 m_{j}} r^{2} b_{j}=0 ;
\end{array}
$$

$w$ here $j$ and $l(j)=1 ; 2$ (this $w i l l$ be henceforth understood unless otherw ise stated). Elim inating $b_{j}$, these equations yield

$$
\begin{array}{r}
h^{2} \frac{\varrho^{2}}{d t^{2}}+\frac{h^{2}}{2 m_{1}} \frac{h^{2}}{2 m_{1}} r^{2} \quad 2 V_{11}{\underset{10}{2} r^{2} a_{1}}_{\frac{h}{2}^{2}}^{m_{12} j} 10 \ddot{j} 20 \dot{j}^{2} a_{2}=0 ;
\end{array}
$$

(together $w$ ith a sym $m$ etric equation, obtained by permuting 1 \$ 2). W e now let $a_{j}=a_{j 0} \exp \left[i\left(k \quad r \quad{ }_{k} t\right)\right]+$ com plex conjugate, where $k$ and $k$ are the wavevector and the frequency of the $m$ odulation, respectively, viz. @=@t! $i_{k}$ and $@=@ x_{n}$ ! $i k_{n}\left(x_{n} \quad\right.$ fx;y; zg for $n=1 ; 2 ; 3$ ) i.e. $@^{2}=@ t^{2}!\quad{ }_{k}^{2}$ and $r^{2}$ ! $k^{2}$. A fter som e algebra, we obtain the eigenvalue problem : $M a=(h!)^{2} a$, where $a=\left(a_{1} ; a_{2}\right)^{T}$, and the $m$ atrix ele$m$ ents are given by $M_{j j}=e_{j}\left(e_{j}+2 V_{j j} j\right.$ jof $) \quad h^{2} \quad \underset{j}{2}$ and $M_{j 1}=2 e V_{j 1} j_{j 0} \ddot{j}_{10} j h^{2} \quad \underset{j 1}{2}$; where we have de ned $e_{j}=h^{2} k^{2}=2 m_{j}$. The frequency ! and the wave num ber $k$ are therefore related by the dispersion relation

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
2 & 2 & 2 & 2  \tag{4}\\
\mathrm{k} & 1 & \mathrm{k} & 2
\end{array}
$$

where the coupling is expressed via ${ }_{c}^{4}=\quad \begin{array}{cc}2 & 2 \\ c_{12}\end{array}$ $M_{12} \mathrm{M}_{21}=\mathrm{h}^{4}$ in the right-hand side of Eq. (4). W e 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 $m$ agnitude of $m_{j}, V_{j j}$ and $V_{j 1}$.

## IV . M ODULATIONAL INSTABILITYOF IN D IV ID UALBECS

In the vanishing coupling lim it, i.e. for $V_{j 1}!0$, the dispersion relation ( Absolute stability is ensured if $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{jj}}>0$. On the other hand, if $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{jj}}<0$, a purely grow ing unstable m ode occurs (viz. $\quad{ }_{k}^{2}<0$ ) for w avenum bers below a critical value $k_{j ; c r}=2\left(m_{j} J_{j j}\right\rangle^{1=2} j_{j 0} \ddagger$. The grow th rate $=$ $i \quad{ }_{k}^{2}$ attains a maxim um value max $=J_{j j} \ddot{j} j_{j o} \xrightarrow{\rho}=h$ at $k=k_{j ; c r}=\overline{2}$.

Recalling the de nitions of $V_{j j}$, we see that a repulsive/attractive scattering length (i.e. positive/negative $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{jj}}$ ) prescribes a stable/unstable (single) BEC behavior. In the follow ing, we shall see how this simple criterion for stability $\left(V_{j j}>0\right)$ is $m$ odi ed by the presence of interaction betw een two he condensates.

## V. MODULATIONAL INSTABILITYOF COUPLED BECS

The dispersion relation ( $\overline{(4)}$ ( ${ }^{\prime}$ ) takes the form of a biquadratic polynom ialequation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\stackrel{4}{\mathrm{k}} \quad \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{D}=0 ; \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{TrM}=\mathrm{h}^{2} \quad 2_{1}^{2}+2_{2}^{2}$ and $\mathrm{D}=\mathrm{DetM}=\mathrm{h}^{4}$
$\begin{array}{llll}2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 12 & 21\end{array}$ are related to the trace and the deter$m$ inant, respectively, of the $m$ atrix $M$. Eq. (5) has the solution

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~T} \quad\left(\mathrm{~T}^{2} \quad 4 \mathrm{D}\right)^{1=2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\underset{\mathrm{k}}{2} ;=\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{l}
2  \tag{7}\\
1
\end{array}+\frac{1}{2}\right) \quad \frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
2 \\
1
\end{array}{\underset{2}{2}}_{2}\right)^{2}+4{\underset{c}{4}}^{1=2}:
$$

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

Stability is ensured (for any $w$ avenum ber $k$ ) if (and only if) both solutions ${ }_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}$; are positive. This is tanta$m$ ount to the follow ing requirem ents being satis ed simultaneously: $\mathrm{T}>0, \mathrm{D}>0$ and $>0$. Since the three quantities T, D and are all even order polynom ials of $k$, one has to investigate three distinct polynom ial inequalities. T he stepstones of the analysis w illbe outlined in the follow ing, though trying to avoid burdening the presentation $w$ ith unnecessary details.
$P^{F i r s t}$, the sign of $T=k^{2}\left[\left(h^{2} k^{2}=4\right)^{P}\left(1=m_{j}^{2}\right)+\right.$ ${ }_{j} V_{j j} j$ jo $\left.\stackrel{?}{j}=m_{j}\right]$ (see de nitions above) depends on (the
sign off the quantity ${ }^{P}{ }_{j} V_{j j} j{ }_{j 0}{ }^{\Omega}=m_{j}$ which has to be positive for all $k$, in order for stability to be ensured (for any $j 0$ and $k$ ). This requires that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}_{11}>0 \text { and } \mathrm{V}_{22}>0: \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

O therw ise, T becom es negative (viz. ${ }_{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{p}}}^{2}<0$, at least) for $\underset{\mathrm{p}}{\mathrm{k}}$ below a critical valye $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{cr} ; 1}={ }^{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{p}}} \overline{\mathrm{K}_{1}}$, where $\left.K_{1}=4\left({ }^{\mathrm{P}} \quad \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{j} j} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{jo}} \mathrm{J}^{2}=\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)=\mathrm{h}^{2}{ }_{j}\left(1=\mathrm{m}_{j}^{2}\right)\right]>0$ (cf. the single BEC criterion above); this is always possible for a su ciently large perturbation am plitude j $10 j$ if, say, $\mathrm{V}_{11}<0$ (even if $\mathrm{V}_{22}>0$ ). 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 w ould be individually stable).

Second, D $=\begin{array}{cccc}2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 12 & 21\end{array}$ is an 8th-orderpolynom ial in $k$, which gan be factorized as $D \quad k^{4}\left(k^{4}+\mathrm{bk}^{2}+\mathrm{C}\right)$, where $b=4{ }_{j}\left(m_{j} V_{j j}\right)=h^{2}$ and $c=16 m_{1} m_{2}\left(V_{11} V_{22}\right.$ $\left.V_{12} V_{21}\right) j{ }_{10}{ }^{\text {J }} \mathrm{j}_{20} J^{\Omega}=h^{4}$ (note that $\left.b^{2} \quad 4 c>0\right)$. The stability requirem ents $\mathrm{b}>0$ and $\mathrm{c}>0$ (in order for $D$ to be positive for any value of $k>0$ ) am ount to $\mathrm{m}_{1} \mathrm{~V}_{11}+\mathrm{m}_{2} \mathrm{~V}_{22}>0$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}_{11} \mathrm{~V}_{22} \quad \mathrm{~V}_{12} \mathrm{~V}_{21}>0 ; \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively. O nly the latter condition for stability has to be retained, since the form er one is autom atically covered by (8) above. Tobe speci c , solving $\mathrm{D}=0$ for $\mathrm{k}^{2}=\mathrm{K}_{2}$; , viz. $\mathrm{K}_{2 ;}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{b} & (\mathrm{B} & 4 \mathrm{c})^{1=2}\end{array}\right]=2$, we see that: (i) if $\mathrm{b}<0<\mathrm{C}^{\prime}$ then $0<\mathrm{K}_{2 ;}<\mathrm{K}_{2 ;+}$, and $\mathrm{D}<0$ for $\overline{\mathrm{K}_{2 ;}}<\mathrm{k}<\overline{\mathrm{K}_{2 ;+}}$ (instability for short w avelengths); (ii) if $\mathrm{c}<0$ (regardless ofb), then $\mathrm{K}_{2 \text {; }}<0<\mathrm{K}_{2 \text {;+ }}$, and $\mathrm{D}<0$ for $0<\mathrm{k}<\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\mathrm{K}_{2 \text {; }^{+}}}$;
(iii) if.b>0 and $\mathrm{c}>0$, then $\mathrm{K}_{2 \text {; }}<\mathrm{K}_{2 \text {; }}<0$, 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 m utual interaction potential $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{jl}}$ am ong the bosons.

Finally, the positivity of $=T^{2} \quad 4 \mathrm{D}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \\ 2\end{array}\right)^{2}+$ $4{ }_{12}^{2} \frac{2}{21}$ is only ensured (for every value of k and $\mathrm{j} j 0 \mathrm{l}$ if $\begin{array}{ccc}2 & 2 & 2 \\ 12 & M_{12} M_{21}>0 \text {, i.e. if }\end{array}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}_{12} \mathrm{~V}_{21}>0: \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

If this condition is not $m$ et, the solution $(\underline{\bar{\sigma}})$ above has a nite im aginary part, which accounts for am plitude instability due to the extemal perturbation. For rigour, we note that bears the form $=k^{4}\left(c_{4} k^{4} \quad \varepsilon_{k} k^{2}+c_{0}\right)$ (where $c_{4}>0$; the com plex expressions for $c_{n}$ are om itted). If ${ }^{0} \quad \varepsilon_{2}^{2} \quad 4 \sigma C_{4} \quad \mathrm{~V}_{2} \mathrm{~V}_{21}<0$, i.e. if (10) is $m$ et, then $>0$ for any value of $k$. If ${ }^{0}>0$, on the other hand, denoting $\mathrm{K}_{3} ;=\left[\begin{array}{cc}\mathrm{C}_{2} & \left(\mathrm{G}_{2}^{2} \quad 4 \varrho \mathrm{C}_{4}\right)^{1=2}\end{array}\right]=\left(2 \mathrm{C}_{4}\right)$, we nd that:
(i) stability is only ensured (since $\mathrm{K}_{3}$; $<\mathrm{K}_{3 \text {; }}<0<\mathrm{k}^{2}$ ) if $\mathrm{c}_{2}<0<\mathrm{c}_{0}$ (nevertheless, this condition depends on
the perturbation am plitudes j jo jand $m$ ay alw ays be violated).
(ij) A gain, a nite unstable wavenum ber interval k 2 ( $\overline{\mathrm{K}_{3 ;} ;} ; \overline{\mathrm{K}_{3 ;+}}$ ) is obtained for $\mathrm{C}_{2}>0$ and $\mathrm{c}_{0}>0$.
(iii) $p$ Finally, instability $w$ ill be observed for $k \quad 2$ ( 0 ; $\overline{\mathrm{K}_{3 ;+}}$ ) if $\mathrm{c}_{0}<0$ (regardless of $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ ).

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

Sum $m$ arizing, we have derived a set ofexplicit criteria, (8) to (10) above, which should all be satis ed in order for a boson pair to be stable. T herefore, 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 im aginary part and the solution blows up in tim e. A few com $m$ ents and qualltative conchusions should how ever be m entioned.
First, for a sym $m$ etric 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 $V_{j j}<0$, the pair $w i l l$ be unstable: only pairs consisting of stable bosons can be stable. Interestingly, in the case of individually unstable BECs (viz. $V_{j j}<0$, for $j=1$ or 2 ), the instability characteristics are strongly m odi ed. For instance, in the case of a symm etric unstable boson pair (viz. $\mathrm{V}_{11}=\mathrm{V}_{22}<0$ and $m_{1}=m_{2}$ ), an extended unstable $w$ avenum ber region and an enhanced grow th rate can be obtained, as can be checked via a tedious calculation; cf. Fig. ${ }_{\underline{1} 11}^{11}$. Further$m$ ore, we have pointed out the appearance of secondary instability $\backslash \mathrm{w}$ indow s ", i.e. unstable wave num ber intervals beyond ( $k_{\mathrm{cr}} ; \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{cr}}^{0}$ ), where $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{cr}} \in 0$.

These results above follow from a set ofexplicit stability criteria. B oth BEC sw ere assum ed to lie in the ground state, for sim plicity, although no other assum ption was $m$ ade on the sign and/orm agnitude of the relevant physical param eters. N aturally, a future extension of this w ork should consider the extemalcon nem ent potential, im posed on the trapped condensates. O ur results can be tested, and can hopefilly be con m ed, by designed experim ents.
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FIG.1: The grow th rafe versus the wavenum berk (in units
 sym $m$ etric pair of coupled unstable ( $V_{j 1}<0$ for $j ; 1=1 ; 2$ ) BECs (upper curve) as com pared to the single BEC case (low er curve).
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