

# Sweeping from the superfluid to Mott phase in the Bose-Hubbard model

Ralf Schützhold<sup>1,\*</sup>, Michael Uhlmann<sup>1</sup>, Yan Xu<sup>1</sup>, and Uwe R. Fischer<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Dresden, D-01062 Dresden, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, Institut für Theoretische Physik  
Auf der Morgenstelle 14, D-72076 Tübingen, Germany*

We study the sweep through the quantum phase transition from the superfluid to the Mott state for the Bose-Hubbard model with a time-dependent tunneling rate  $J(t)$ . In the experimentally relevant case of exponential decay,  $J(t) \propto e^{-\gamma t}$ , an adapted mean-field expansion for large fillings  $n$  yields a scaling solution for the fluctuations. This enables us to analytically calculate the evolution of the number and phase variations (on-site) and correlations (off-site) for slow ( $\gamma \ll \mu$ ), intermediate, and fast (non-adiabatic  $\gamma \gg \mu$ ) sweeps, where  $\mu$  is the chemical potential. Finally, we derive the dynamical decay of the off-diagonal long-range order as well as the temporal shrinkage of the superfluid fraction in a persistent ring-current setup.

PACS numbers: 73.43.Nq, 03.75.Lm, 03.75.Kk, 05.70.Fh.

For many systems, the equilibrium properties (the thermal ensemble at finite temperatures or the ground state at zero temperature) are quite well understood. However, strictly speaking, the equilibrium state applies to purely static situations only. For dynamical systems, the adiabatic theorem states that the actual quantum state remains close to the ground state (at zero temperature) if the external time-dependence is slow enough, i.e., much slower than the internal frequencies of the system determined by its energy gaps. If this adiabaticity condition fails, however, non-equilibrium effects become important, leading to many intriguing phenomena. For example, the usual split into the ground state plus small quantum fluctuations around it is no longer unique, which usually leads to effects such as the amplification of quantum fluctuations and the creation of quasi-particles.

A prototypical example for such a situation is a second-order quantum phase transition [1], cf. Fig. 1. At the critical point, the energy gap vanishes and the response time diverges. Consequently, sweeping through the phase transition by means of a time-dependent external parameter  $1/J(t)$  with a finite velocity  $dJ/dt < 0$  inevitably violates adiabaticity close enough to the critical point and so generates non-equilibrium effects. Fostered by the tremendous progress in the experimental capabilities, there has been increasing interest in quantum phenomena at low temperatures in general and quantum criticality in particular. In view of the creation of entanglement [2, 3], quantum phase transitions are also relevant for quantum information (the continuum limit of an adiabatic quantum algorithm represents just a sweep through a quantum phase transition). Finally, dynamical quantum phase transitions bear strong similarities to cosmological phenomena: If the stable phase permits topological defects (symmetry-breaking transition), a quantum version of the Kibble-Zurek mechanism may create those defects [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In case the initial spectrum contains gapless modes, their quantum fluctuations will generally be amplified in close analogy to cosmic inflation [9, 10]. Both

phenomena can be understood in terms of the emergence of an effective cosmic horizon which corresponds to the loss of causal connection and the breakdown of adiabaticity near the critical point.




FIG. 1: [Color online] Sketch (not to scale) of level structure near the critical point, i.e., plot of the energy of the ground state (green solid line) and the energy gap (thin blue line) as a function of the external parameter  $1/J(t)$ . Since the response time diverges at the critical point  $J = J_c$ , adiabaticity breaks down near the transition for any finite sweep velocity  $dJ/dt$ . Hence the actual state  $|\Psi(t)\rangle$  (red dashed line) slightly deviates from the exact ground state already before the critical point  $J = J_c$  is reached and finally lies energetically somewhere between the coherent state (dotted green line) and the Mott state.

Besides the Ising model (which can be solved analytically [1, 6]), another archetypical example is the quantum phase transition between the superfluid and the Mott insulator state in the Bose-Hubbard model (where no closed solution has been found). This model provides a simplified description for the problem of interacting bosons hopping on a lattice [11]; its implementation with atoms/molecules in optical lattices [12], and the subsequent experimental realization of the Mott-Hubbard transition [13] has recently caused a large amount of research activity [14]. The superfluid phase possesses a rich spectrum ranging from topological defects (e.g., kinks in one dimension) to gapless quasi-particle excitations (phonons) but the Mott state does not. Hence the (quantum) Kibble-Zurek mechanism requires the dynamical

transition from the Mott to the superfluid state (quantum melting) whereas the amplification of the quantum fluctuations of the phonon modes occurs in the opposite direction (quantum freezing). The (mostly numerical) studies thus far [8, 15] have been devoted to the first case (quantum melting). Here, we study the dynamical behavior of the superfluid to Mott quantum phase transition starting, by contrast to previous investigations, from the superfluid side of the transition. We thus investigate the quantum freezing of number fluctuations [16, 17] and predict their dependence on the sweep rate  $\gamma$ . The thereby created number-squeezed state and its number fluctuations can be studied experimentally, for example by the interference of condensates released from different optical lattice wells [18]. As further observables representing the actual quantum state  $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ , to bring out the difference to either the superfluid or Mott states (cf. Fig. 1), we derive the temporal evolution of the off-diagonal long-range order and the superfluid fraction.

The Bose-Hubbard model with local contact interactions is, on a rather general type of lattice, described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = J(t) \sum_{\alpha\beta} M_{\alpha\beta} \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\beta + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{\alpha} (\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger)^2 \hat{a}_\alpha^2. \quad (1)$$

Here  $\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger$  and  $\hat{a}_\alpha$  denote the bosonic creation and annihilation operators at the lattice site  $\alpha$ . The energy scale is set by the on-site repulsion  $U > 0$  and the time-dependent tunneling rate  $J(t) \geq 0$ . The structure of the lattice is encoded in the matrix  $M_{\alpha\beta}$ , which is supposed to obey the same (translational) symmetry group, e.g., for a one-dimensional chain with nearest-neighbor hopping, we have  $M_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} - \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\alpha,\beta+1} + \delta_{\alpha,\beta-1})$ .

The initial state is the homogeneous superfluid phase,  $J \gg J_c = \mathcal{O}(U/n)$ , see [19], with a large integer filling  $n = \langle \hat{n}_\alpha \rangle \gg 1$  (where  $\hat{n}_\alpha = \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha$ ), which facilitates a particle-number conserving mean-field expansion [20, 21]

$$\hat{a}_\alpha = \left( \psi_0 + \hat{\chi}_\alpha + \hat{\zeta}_\alpha \right) \hat{A} / \sqrt{\hat{N}}, \quad (2)$$

with  $\hat{A} = \hat{a}_\Sigma (\hat{a}_\Sigma^\dagger \hat{a}_\Sigma)^{-1/2} \hat{N}^{1/2}$  and  $\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{A} = \hat{N} = \sum_{\alpha} \hat{n}_\alpha$ , where  $\hat{a}_\Sigma = \sum_{\alpha} \hat{a}_\alpha$ . Here the main idea is to expand the original operator  $\hat{a}_\alpha$  into powers of  $n \gg 1$ , considering the (formal) limit  $n \uparrow \infty$  with the chemical potential  $\mu \gg Un$  remaining finite, i.e.,  $U = \mathcal{O}(1/n)$ . The leading term is the order parameter  $\psi_0 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$  and the quantum corrections  $\hat{\chi}_\alpha = \mathcal{O}(n^0)$  correspond to quasi-particle excitations. For the validity of this expansion, the remaining higher-order corrections  $\hat{\zeta}_\alpha$  must be small  $\hat{\zeta}_\alpha \ll \mathcal{O}(n^0)$ . Inserting the above expansion (2) into the equation of motion  $i\hbar \partial_t \hat{a}_\alpha = J(t) \sum_{\beta} M_{\alpha\beta} \hat{a}_\beta + U \hat{n}_\alpha \hat{a}_\alpha$  obtained from (1) and sorting into powers of  $n$  yields the analogue of the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations for the excitations at site  $\alpha$  ( $\hbar \equiv 1$  throughout)

$$i\partial_t \hat{\chi}_\alpha = J(t) \sum_{\beta} M_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\chi}_\beta + 2U |\psi_0|^2 \hat{\chi}_\alpha + U \psi_0^2 \hat{\chi}_\alpha^\dagger, \quad (3)$$

and for the remaining higher-order corrections

$$i\partial_t \hat{\zeta}_\alpha = J(t) \sum_{\beta} M_{\alpha\beta} \hat{\zeta}_\beta + 2U |\psi_0|^2 \hat{\zeta}_\alpha + U \psi_0^2 \hat{\zeta}_\alpha^\dagger + \quad (4) \\ + 2U \psi_0 \hat{\chi}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{\chi}_\alpha + U \psi_0^* \hat{\chi}_\alpha^2 + U \hat{\chi}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{\chi}_\alpha^2 + \mathcal{O}(U \hat{\zeta}_\alpha).$$

Deep in the superfluid phase (our initial state), the higher-order corrections  $\hat{\zeta}_\alpha$  are small and the mean-field expansion (2) works very well. If we approach the Mott phase, however, these corrections start to grow according to Eq. (4) and, at some point, the mean-field expansion (2) breaks down. The characteristic time-scale of this breakdown can be estimated from the nonlinear source terms in Eq. (4) which are suppressed to  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$  in view of  $U = \mathcal{O}(1/n)$ ,  $\psi_0 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$  and  $\hat{\chi}_\alpha = \mathcal{O}(n^0)$ . Hence (starting in the superfluid phase), the higher-order corrections remain small as long as  $Ut\sqrt{n} \ll 1$ , i.e., for evolution times of order  $t = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ . Thus we can extrapolate the mean-field expansion even into the Mott phase for some time  $t = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ , and follow the evolution of the instabilities which develop because the superfluid state is no longer the ground state of the system.

The polar decomposition  $\hat{a}_\alpha = \exp\{i\hat{\phi}_\alpha\} \sqrt{\hat{n}_\alpha}$  yields the linearized number fluctuations  $\delta\hat{n}_\alpha$  via  $\hat{n}_\alpha = n + \delta\hat{n}_\alpha$  and accordingly the conjugate phase fluctuations  $\delta\hat{\phi}_\alpha$ , where  $\hat{\chi}_\alpha = \psi_0 [\delta\hat{n}_\alpha / (2n) + i\delta\hat{\phi}_\alpha] + \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ . In terms of these fluctuations  $\delta\hat{n}_\alpha$ , Eq. (3) can be diagonalized by a normal-mode expansion into the eigenvectors of the matrix  $M_{\alpha\beta}$  labeled by the generalized momenta  $\kappa$

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{1}{J(t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + 8\lambda_\kappa [Un + 2J(t)\lambda_\kappa] \right) \delta\hat{n}_\kappa = 0, \quad (5)$$

where  $\lambda_\kappa$  are the corresponding eigenvalues of  $M_{\alpha\beta}$ .

For small  $\lambda_\kappa$ , the above evolution equation is analogous to the modes of a quantum field within an expanding universe with the wavenumber  $k \propto \sqrt{\lambda_\kappa}$ . Pursuing the similarity a bit further, we get the analogue of a cosmic horizon with the horizon size

$$\Delta_h(t) = \int_t^\infty dt' \sqrt{J(t')Un}, \quad (6)$$

if  $J(t)$  changes fast enough [9, 10]. Note that the upper integral limit should not be taken literally, since it must still be within the region of validity of the mean-field expansion. In case an effective horizon occurs, its size constantly decreases. Hence all modes (with small  $\lambda_\kappa$ ) will qualitatively follow the same evolution – but at different times: Initially, the wavelength of the modes is well inside the horizon,  $\lambda_\kappa \Delta_h^2 \gg 1$ , and the modes oscillate almost freely. At some point of time, however, the constantly shrinking horizon closes in,  $\lambda_\kappa \Delta_h^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ , and thus the causal connection across a wavelength is lost. After that, the modes cannot oscillate anymore and freeze. This process leads to the amplification of the initial quantum fluctuations via squeezing in analogy to the

inflationary epoch in the early universe [9, 10]. We note that these considerations show a major weakness of the adiabatic–impulse approximation used in [7], since modes with different  $\lambda_\kappa$  become non-adiabatic at different times.

Since the tunneling rate  $J$  depends exponentially on the amplitude of the laser which generates the optical lattice [22], we shall consider an exponential time-dependence  $J(t) = J_0 \exp\{-\gamma t\}$  in the following, which is implying the emergence of a quasiparticle horizon according to Eq. (6). Furthermore, Eq. (5) reveals that  $\lambda_\kappa$  can be absorbed by a suitable redefinition of the time coordinate in this case,  $\tau_\kappa = -4\lambda_\kappa J(t)/\gamma$ , leading to

$$\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau_\kappa^2} + \left[ 1 - \frac{2}{\tau_\kappa} \frac{Un}{\gamma} \right] \right) \delta \hat{n}_\kappa = 0. \quad (7)$$

The universal scaling solution resulting from the above equation confirms that modes with different  $\lambda_\kappa$  display the same behavior, but at different times. The only remaining dimensionless parameter is the ratio  $\nu = Un/\gamma$  which is a measure of the sweep velocity:  $\nu \gg 1$  implies a slow and  $\nu \ll 1$  a fast (non-adiabatic) sweep. The differential equation (7) has a universal scaling solution in terms of Whittaker functions [23]

$$\delta \hat{n}_\kappa = \sqrt{n} e^{-\pi\nu/2} W_{i\nu, 1/2}(2i\tau_\kappa) \hat{b}_\kappa + \text{h.c.} \quad (8)$$

The quasi-particle operator  $\hat{b}_\kappa$  annihilates the adiabatic ground state  $\hat{b}_\kappa |\text{in}\rangle = 0$  at early times  $\tau_\kappa \downarrow -\infty$ , where the modes oscillate like  $e^{\pm i\tau_\kappa}$  (which can also be obtained from the asymptotic behavior of the Whittaker functions). According to the arguments presented after Eq. (4), the mean-field expansion remains valid for intermediate times with  $Ut\sqrt{n} \ll 1$  but  $\gamma t \gg 1$ , and hence can be extrapolated to the “late-time” regime  $\tau_\kappa \uparrow 0$  where the functions  $W_{i\nu, 1/2}(2i\tau_\kappa)$  approach a constant value, i.e., the number fluctuations freeze ( $J \downarrow 0$ ). Due to the perfect scaling solution, the frozen value is independent of  $\kappa$ , but the decaying corrections do depend on  $\lambda_\kappa$ :

$$\langle \delta \hat{n}_\kappa^2 \rangle \equiv \langle \text{in} | (\delta \hat{n}_\kappa)^2 | \text{in} \rangle = n \frac{1 - e^{-2\pi\nu}}{2\pi\nu} + \mathcal{O}(t\lambda_\kappa e^{-\gamma t}). \quad (9)$$

Since the leading term is independent of  $\kappa$ , it just yields a local ( $\propto \delta_{\alpha,\beta}$ ) contribution after the mode sum ( $\kappa \rightarrow \alpha$ ) and thus leads to frozen on-site number variations

$$\Delta^2(n_\alpha) = \langle \hat{n}_\alpha^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{n}_\alpha \rangle^2 = \langle \delta \hat{n}_\alpha^2 \rangle = n \frac{1 - e^{-2\pi\nu}}{2\pi\nu}. \quad (10)$$

For a rapid sweep  $\nu \ll 1$ , this variation  $\Delta^2(n_\alpha)$  approaches a constant value  $n$ , which is characteristic of a superfluid phase with Poissonian number statistics [24]. For a slow sweep  $\nu \gg 1$ , the variation  $\Delta^2(n_\alpha)$  becomes small,  $\propto n/\nu$ , and so approaches the behavior deep into the Mott phase (with  $J \downarrow 0$ ), where  $\Delta^2(n_\alpha) = 0$ , cf. [25]. For  $J \downarrow 0$ , the energy  $\langle \hat{H} \rangle$  is basically determined by the variation  $\Delta^2(n_\alpha)$  and hence this quantity describes the

energetic location of the final state in comparison to the coherent state and the Mott state, see Fig. 1.

The sub-leading corrections in  $\langle \delta \hat{n}_\kappa^2 \rangle$  depend on  $\kappa$  and hence determine the off-site ( $\alpha \neq \beta$ ) number correlations which decay exponentially for  $\gamma t \gg 1$

$$\langle \hat{n}_\alpha \hat{n}_\beta \rangle - \langle \hat{n}_\alpha \rangle \langle \hat{n}_\beta \rangle = \langle \delta \hat{n}_\alpha \delta \hat{n}_\beta \rangle = \mathcal{O}(\gamma t e^{-\gamma t}), \quad (11)$$

where we have omitted finite-size effects (which scale with the inverse number of lattice sites), since strictly speaking the mode sum does not include the zero-mode  $\kappa = 0$ .

The conjugate phase fluctuations can be derived in an analogous manner and are determined by the derivatives of the Whittaker functions  $dW_{i\nu, 1/2}/d\tau_\kappa$ . As one would expect [16], they do not freeze – but increase:

$$\langle \delta \hat{\phi}_\kappa^2 \rangle = \nu \frac{1 - e^{-2\pi\nu}}{2\pi n} \gamma^2 t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\gamma t \ln \lambda_\kappa). \quad (12)$$

Again the leading (first) term is independent of  $\kappa$  and thus yields the on-site fluctuations  $\langle \delta \hat{\phi}_\alpha^2 \rangle$  only (which generate the quadratically growing quantum depletion  $\langle \hat{\chi}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{\chi}_\alpha \rangle$  and anomalous term  $\langle \hat{\chi}_\alpha^2 \rangle$ ). The second term is the leading  $\kappa$ -dependent contribution and determines the off-site phase correlations  $\langle \delta \hat{\phi}_\alpha \delta \hat{\phi}_\beta \rangle$ .

The ascent of the phase fluctuations can be understood as a consequence of the emergence of an effective horizon which entails the loss of causal connection between different sites and thus the decay of the phase coherence across the lattice. As one interesting observable, let us discuss the evolution of the off-diagonal long-range order between sites  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  defined by the correlator  $\langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger(t) \hat{a}_\beta(t) \rangle$ . Using the mean-field results valid at intermediate times with  $\gamma t \gg 1$  but  $Ut\sqrt{n} \ll 1$  as the initial conditions, we may derive the ensuing stages of the quantum evolution, where the tunneling rate  $J(t \gg 1/\gamma) \ll 1$  is exponentially small and can be neglected. In this limit, the evolution of the operators can be approximated by  $d\hat{a}_\alpha/dt = -iU\hat{n}_\alpha\hat{a}_\alpha$  which possesses the simple solution  $\hat{a}_\alpha(t) = \exp\{-iU\hat{n}_\alpha^0 t\}\hat{a}_\alpha^0$ . Consequently, we obtain  $\langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger(t) \hat{a}_\beta(t) \rangle = n \langle \exp\{iU(\hat{n}_\alpha - \hat{n}_\beta)t\} \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ . The frozen first-order number fluctuations  $\delta \hat{n}_\alpha$  are in a squeezed state which can (for  $n \gg 1$ ) be approximated by a (continuous) Gaussian distribution. For a Gaussian variable  $X$  with  $\langle X \rangle = 0$ , the exponential average yields  $\langle \exp\{iX\} \rangle = \exp\{-\langle X^2 \rangle/2\}$  and hence we get

$$\langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger(t) \hat{a}_\beta(t) \rangle \approx n \exp\{-U^2 t^2 \Delta^2(n_\alpha)\}. \quad (13)$$

Note that this expression is only valid for time scales  $1/\gamma \ll t \ll 1/U$ ; for  $Ut \in 2\pi\mathbb{N}$  all the exponential factors equal unity again and we have a revival of the phase coherence and thus long-range order similar to a spin echo. (Note that we omit the coupling to the environment in our derivation.) Furthermore, the above Gaussian decay is independent of the distance between the sites  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Since the Fourier transform of  $\langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger(t) \hat{a}_\beta(t) \rangle$  determines

the structure factor  $S(\mathbf{k})$ , the decay of the long-range order (13) directly corresponds to the temporal decrease of the peak in  $S(\mathbf{k})$  at  $\mathbf{k} = 0$ . This dependence on time and sweep rate can be observed with time-of-flight measurements [26] (which basically map out  $|S(\mathbf{k})|$ ) by varying  $\gamma$  and the time delay between the phase transition and the release of the condensate.

Let us calculate another simple experimental signature, which involves just neighboring sites, namely the superfluid fraction  $n_{\text{sf}}/n$ . To this end, we specify our lattice and choose a one-dimensional ring-geometry  $\alpha \rightarrow \ell$  with the circumference coordinate  $\ell$  [27]. In order to generate a persistent current, we impose a small phase gradient externally by trapping a flux quantum on the ring:  $\psi_0 = \sqrt{n} \exp\{-i\mu t + 2\pi i \ell/L\}$ , where  $L \gg 1$  denotes the number of sites. Naturally, for a decreasing tunneling rate  $J(t)$ , the induced current diminishes also. In addition, the number of particles contributing to this flux goes down – which will be used as a measure for the superfluid fraction. The flux can be determined by the usual Noether current corresponding to the  $U(1)$  invariance and is related to the nearest neighbor correlation function  $\langle \hat{a}_\ell^\dagger \hat{a}_{\ell+1} \rangle$ . Hence, the shrinkage of the superfluid fraction is given by the same [28] expression as in Eq. (13)

$$\frac{n_{\text{sf}}}{n} \approx \exp\left\{-U^2 t^2 n \frac{1 - e^{-2\pi\nu}}{2\pi\nu}\right\}. \quad (14)$$

In the case of a very rapid (impulse) sweep,  $\nu \ll 1$ , the superfluid fraction decays with  $\exp\{-nU^2 t^2\}$ , i.e., independent of  $\gamma$ . Conversely, for a slow sweep  $\nu \gg 1$ , the decay takes much longer:  $\exp\{-nU^2 t^2/(2\pi\nu)\}$ .

In conclusion, an adapted mean-field expansion enables us to analytically calculate the freezing of number fluctuations and the growth of phase fluctuations during an (exponential) sweep through the superfluid  $\rightarrow$  Mott quantum phase transition. As further experimental signatures, we predict the temporal decay of the superfluid fraction  $n_{\text{sf}}/n$  and of the central  $\mathbf{k} = 0$  peak in the structure factor  $S(\mathbf{k})$ .

This work was supported by the Emmy Noether Programme of the German Research Foundation (DFG) under grant No. SCHU 1557/1-1,2. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the COSLAB Programme of the ESF.

\* schuetz@theory.phy.tu-dresden.de † uwe.fischer@uni-tuebingen.de

---

[1] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).  
 [2] G. Vidal, J.I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).  
 [3] U. Dorner, P. Fedichev, D. Jaksch, M. Lewenstein, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 073601 (2003).  
 [4] B. Damski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 035701 (2005).  
 [5] W.H. Zurek, U. Dorner, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 105701 (2005).

[6] J. Dziarmaga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 245701 (2005).  
 [7] B. Damski and W.H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 063405 (2006).  
 [8] F.M. Cucchietti, B. Damski, J. Dziarmaga, and W.H. Zurek, preprint cond-mat/0601650.  
 [9] U.R. Fischer and R. Schützhold, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 063615 (2004).  
 [10] R. Schützhold, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 135703 (2005).  
 [11] M.P.A. Fisher, P.B. Weichman, G. Grinstein, and D.S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 546 (1989).  
 [12] D. Jaksch, C. Bruder, J.I. Cirac, C.W. Gardiner, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3108 (1998).  
 [13] M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. Esslinger, T.W. Hänsch, and I. Bloch, Nature **415**, 39 (2002).  
 [14] See for a review D. Jaksch and P. Zoller, Annals of Physics **315**, 52 (2005).  
 [15] A. Polkovnikov, S. Sachdev, and S.M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 053607 (2002); S.R. Clark and D. Jaksch, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 043612 (2004); K. Sengupta, S. Powell, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 053616 (2004); L. Isella and J. Ruostekoski, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 011601(R) (2005).  
 [16] In the superfluid phase, the phase fluctuations are small and the number fluctuations are large [for  $J \gg U$  in Eq. (1) we approximately have a coherent state with Poissonian number statistics], whereas the Mott phase shows the opposite behavior.  
 [17] F. Gerbier, S. Fölling, A. Widera, O. Mandel, and I. Bloch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 090401 (2006).  
 [18] C. Orzel, A.K. Tuchman, M. L. Fenselau, M. Yasuda, and M.A. Kasevich, Science **291**, 2386 (2001).  
 [19] L. Amico and V. Penna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2189 (1998).  
 [20] M. Girardeau and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. **113**, 755 (1959); C.W. Gardiner, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 1414 (1997).  
 [21] Y. Castin and R. Dum, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 3008 (1998).  
 [22] In sufficiently deep  $d$ -dimensional simple cubic lattices,  $J \propto (V_0/E_R)^{3/4} \exp\{-2\sqrt{V_0/E_R}\}$  and  $U \propto (V_0/E_R)^{d/4}$  hold, where  $V_0$  is the lattice depth given by the laser intensity and  $E_R$  is the recoil energy, cf. D. Boers, C. Weiss, and M. Holthaus, Europhys. Lett. **67**, 887 (2004).  
 [23] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun (eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1970); A. Erdélyi, W. Magnus, F. Oberhettinger, and F.G. Tricomi, *Higher Transcendental Functions, Vol. I* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953).  
 [24] J. Javanainen, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 4902 (1999).  
 [25] C. Schroll, F. Marquardt, and C. Bruder, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 053609 (2004).  
 [26] F. Gerbier, A. Widera, S. Fölling, O. Mandel, T. Gericke, and I. Bloch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 050404 (2005).  
 [27] The experimental implementation of a ring-shaped optical lattice has been discussed in L. Amico, A. Osterloh, and F. Cataliotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 063201 (2005). The persistent ring-currents show up in characteristic interference patterns of the density after time-of-flight.  
 [28] Note that the coincidence between the long and short-range behavior in Eqs. (13) and (14) is a consequence of the exponential time-dependence of  $J(t)$  which allows for a scaling solution. The freezing of the number fluctuations and the growth of the phase fluctuations is a general phenomenon, but the dependence on  $\kappa$  is different for other sweep dynamics; e.g., for a linear sweep  $dJ/dt = \text{const.}$ , the leading contributions to (12) would scale as  $\lambda_\kappa^{-1/3}$  for small  $\lambda_\kappa$  [10].