Instability of Rotationally Tuned Dipolar Bose-Einstein Condensates
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The possibility of effectively inverting the sign of the dipole-dipole interaction, by fast rotation of the dipole polarization, is pivotal to both the stability of dipolar BECs and to realize regimes of novel physics. To date, experimentalists have controlled this potential by exploiting Feshbach resonances to tune the contact interaction, thereby allowing for DDI-dominated regimes. Furthermore it has been suggested that the magnitude and sign of the DDI can be tuned via rotation of the dipole moments [23]. Consider a BEC of bosons with magnetic dipole moment \( \mu_d \), polarized uniformly along an axis \( \hat{e}(t) \), such that the DDI is

\[
U_{dd}(r,t) = \frac{C_{dd}}{4\pi} \left( 1 - 3 \left( \hat{e}(t) \cdot r \right)^2 \right),
\]

where \( C_{dd} = \mu_0 \mu_d^2 \) and \( \mu_0 \) is the vacuum permeability. If \( \hat{e}(t) \) rotates about the \( z \)-axis at a tilt angle \( \varphi \), the time averaged DDI over one rotation cycle is [23]

\[
\langle U_{dd}(r) \rangle = \frac{C_{dd}}{4\pi} \left( 3 \cos^2 \varphi - 1 \right) \left[ 1 - 3 \left( \hat{z} \cdot r \right)^2 \right].
\]

Thus, in the rapid-rotation limit, the tilt angle \( \varphi \) may be used to tune the effective strength of the DDI and in particular, when \( \cos^2 \varphi > 1/3 \), the effective DDI strength becomes negative, corresponding to an unusual ‘anti-dipolar’ regime in which side-by-side alignment of the dipole moments is energetically preferred to head-to-tail alignments. Subsequent theoretical studies of dipolar BECs in this regime, which invoked the rotational tuning mechanism by setting \( C_{dd} < 0 \), led to predictions of novel physics such as molecular bound states in dark solitons [24], multi-dimensional dark [25] and bright [26, 27] solitons, stratified turbulence [28] and the roton instability of vortex lines [29]. In this direction, a recent experimental study of rotational tuning by Tang et al. [30] has reported a realization of the anti-dipolar regime.

In this work we revisit rotational tuning of a dipolar BEC, in a cylindrically symmetric harmonic trap of the form

\[
V_T(r) = \frac{1}{2} m \omega_z^2 (x^2 + y^2 + \gamma^2 z^2),
\]

and model polarization rotational angular frequencies, \( \Omega \), greater than \( \omega_z \). This rotation is seen to result in an asymmetry of the condensate about \( \hat{z} \) that is not evident if the DDI due to a rotating polarization is directly replaced by its time-averaged counterpart. This asymmetry results in a dynamical instability, similar to those predicted [31, 32] and observed [33, 34] for non-dipolar condensates in rotating ellipsoidal traps, that prevents the formation of a dynamically-stable rotationally-tuned state. This is elucidated via two distinct approaches, one being based on a semi-analytical treatment in the Thomas-Fermi (TF) limit, and the other being time-dependent numerical simulations. These results raise major questions over the pursuit of rotational tuning of dipolar BECs.

As the maximally anti-dipolar regime occurs for \( \varphi = \pi/2 \), we consider the polarizing field \( \hat{e} \) to be rotating in the \( x-y \) plane at angular frequency \( \Omega \), and work in a reference frame co-rotating with \( \hat{e} \) such that we may fix \( \hat{e} = \hat{x} \) in this frame. Then, the dipolar condensate order parameter \( \psi(r,t) \) [35] for bosons of mass \( m \) can be mod-
eled by the dipole Gross-Pitaevskii Equation (dGPE),
\[ i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2 \nabla^2}{2m} + V_T + V_{int} + i\hbar \Omega \left( x \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - y \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \right] \psi. \] (3)

Assuming that the rotation frequency is slow enough so that the dipole moments remain aligned along \( \hat{e} \) at all times, the interaction potential \( V_{int} \) is specified by [37]
\[ V_{int}(\mathbf{r}, t) = g |\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 + \int d\mathbf{r}' U_{dd}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') |\psi(\mathbf{r}', t)|^2, \] (4)

where \( g = 4\pi\hbar^2 a_s / m \) and \( a_s \) is the bosonic s-wave scattering length. The DDI strength may be related to \( a_s \) through a dimensionless ratio \( \epsilon_{dd} = C_{dd} / (3g) \).

Previous studies of rotationally-tuned dipolar BECs have involved setting \( \Omega = 0 \) and replacing \( U_{dd} \) with \( \langle U_{dd} \rangle \) in Eq. (4). To test the validity of this procedure, we solve for the stationary solutions of Eq. (3), which obey \( i\hbar\partial_t \psi = \mu \psi \), with \( \mu \) being the condensate’s chemical potential. We re-express the order parameter as \( \psi = \sqrt{\gamma} \exp(iS) \), where \( S \) is the condensate phase and \( n \), the condensate density, is normalized to the condensate number \( N \) via \( \int d^3r n(\mathbf{r}) = N \). In the TF limit, obtained by neglecting the zero-point kinetic energy of the condensate [35], the stationary solutions are of the form
\[ n_{TF}(\mathbf{r}) = n_0 \left( 1 - \frac{x^2}{\kappa_x^2 R_z^2} - \frac{y^2}{\kappa_y^2 R_z^2} - \frac{z^2}{R_z^2} \right), \] (5)

\[ S_{TF}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \alpha xy - \mu t / \hbar, \] (6)

Here \( n_0 = 15N/(8\pi\kappa_x\kappa_y R_z^2) \) is the peak density, \( R_i \) is the TF radius of the dipolar BEC along the \( i \)-axis, and \( \kappa_x = R_x / R_z \) and \( \kappa_y = R_y / R_z \) are the condensate aspect ratios, with respect to \( z \), along \( \hat{x} \) and \( \hat{y} \) respectively.

The TF stationary solutions are uniquely determined by a set of consistency relations, whose derivation is presented in the Supplemental Material. For a given choice of \( \{ \gamma, \epsilon_{dd}, \Omega, \omega_L \} \), the consistency relations are given by:
\[ \kappa_x^2 = \frac{\omega_x^2}{\zeta} \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_{dd} \left( \frac{9}{2} \kappa_x^2 \kappa_y^2 \beta_{200} - 1 \right) \right], \] (7)

\[ \kappa_y^2 = \frac{\omega_y^2}{\zeta} \left[ 1 + \epsilon_{dd} \left( \frac{3}{2} \kappa_x^2 \kappa_y^2 \beta_{110} - 1 \right) \right], \] (8)

\[ 0 = (\alpha + \Omega) \left( \frac{\omega_x^2}{\zeta} - \frac{9}{2} \epsilon_{dd} \frac{\omega_x^2 \kappa_x \kappa_y \gamma^2}{2 \beta_{200}} \right) \] 

\[ + (\alpha - \Omega) \left( \frac{\omega_y^2}{\zeta} - \frac{3}{2} \epsilon_{dd} \frac{\omega_x^2 \kappa_x \kappa_y \gamma^2}{2 \beta_{110}} \right). \] (9)

Here, \( \alpha, \omega_x, \omega_y, \beta_{ijk} \) and \( \zeta \) are defined by the following:
\[ \alpha = \frac{\kappa_x^2 - \kappa_y^2}{\kappa_x^2 + \kappa_y^2} \Omega, \] (10)

\[ \omega_x^2 = \omega_y^2 + \alpha^2 - 2\alpha \Omega, \omega_y^2 = \omega_x^2 + \alpha^2 + 2\alpha \Omega. \] (11)

\[ \beta_{ijk} = \int_0^\infty \left( s + \kappa_x^2 \right)^{i-\frac{1}{2}} \left( s + \kappa_y^2 \right)^{j-\frac{1}{2}} \left( s + 1 \right)^{-k-\frac{1}{2}} ds. \] (12)

\[ \zeta = 1 + \epsilon_{dd} \left( \frac{3}{2} \kappa_x \kappa_y \beta_{101} - 1 \right). \] (13)

Equation (10) encapsulates the in-plane anisotropy of the stationary TF density as a function of \( \Omega \), with a positive (negative) \( \alpha \) implying that the condensate density is elongated along \( \hat{x} \) (\( \hat{y} \)). Figure 1 shows how \( \alpha \) varies with \( \Omega \) for (a, b) various values of \( \epsilon_{dd} \) while fixing \( \gamma \), and for (c, d) various values of \( \gamma \) while fixing \( \epsilon_{dd} \). If \( \epsilon_{dd} = 0, \alpha = 0 \) is a valid solution for all \( \Omega \). A bifurcation occurs at \( \Omega = \Omega_0 \), with the addition of two new branches, symmetric about the \( \Omega \)-axis, that exist only for \( \Omega_b \leq \Omega < \omega_L \). The symmetry about the \( \Omega \)-axis is broken when \( \epsilon_{dd} > 0 \). Instead, we have \( \alpha > 0 \) when \( 0 < \Omega < \Omega_0 \), and this branch persists for \( \Omega_b \leq \Omega < \omega_L \). The bifurcation is now in the form of two additional \( \alpha < 0 \) solutions for \( \Omega > \omega_L \), which are simply connected to each other at \( \Omega = \Omega_b \). The two branches with the highest \( |\alpha(\Omega)| \) terminate at \( \Omega = \omega_L \). This is characteristic of the TF limit in a rotating frame, with similar bifurcations occurring in a BEC rotating about the \( z \)-axis with a planar trapping ellipticity, with or without \( z \)-polarised dipoles [31] [39] [41]. This has been attributed to the \( L_z \) = 2 quadrupole mode being energetically unstable for \( \Omega > \Omega_b \), resulting in \( \Omega_b(\epsilon_{dd} = 0) = \omega_L / \sqrt{2} \) as demonstrated in Fig. 1 (a) [31] [42].

It is evident that these rotating-frame solutions tend towards cylindrical symmetry \( (\alpha = 0) \) as \( \Omega \to \infty \). We proceed to test whether they agree with the non-rotating TF stationary solutions found by utilising the time-averaged DDI. The latter are exactly symmetric about \( \hat{z} \) and possess an aspect ratio \( \kappa_x \equiv \kappa_x = \kappa_y \) specified via [35] [44]

\[ 3\epsilon_{dd} \kappa_x^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{f(\kappa_1)}{1 - \kappa_x^2} - 1 \right) = (\epsilon_{dd} + 2) \left( \gamma^2 - \kappa_x^2 \right), \] (14)

\[ f(\kappa_1) = \frac{1 + 2\kappa_x^2}{1 - \kappa_x^2} - \frac{3\kappa_x^4 \text{arctanh} \sqrt{1 - \kappa_x^2}}{(1 - \kappa_x^2)^{3/2}}. \] (15)

We compare this with the true time-averaged condensate density by transforming Eq. (15) to the laboratory coordi-
nates and time-averaging over one rotation cycle, yielding the time-averaged aspect ratio $\kappa_\parallel = \sqrt{2(\kappa_\perp^2 + \kappa_\parallel^2)^{-1/2}}$.

Figure 2 compares $\kappa_\perp$ and $\kappa_\parallel$ as a function of $\epsilon_{dd}$, with a range of trapping aspect ratios, $\gamma$, being considered and with $\kappa_\parallel$ evaluated at a suitably high rotation frequency ($\Omega = 5\omega_\perp$). An almost perfect agreement between the two methodologies is evident. Note that when $\gamma = 1$, the condensate is flattened with respect to the $z$-axis, consistent with an effective side-by-side orientation of $z$-polarized dipole moments.

To verify the stationary solutions, Eqs. (7) – (9), we numerically solve the 3D dGPE for a dipolar BEC of $N = 10^5$ bosons; $N$ is chosen to be sufficiently large for a meaningful comparison with the TF analysis [38]. With $\Omega$ and $\gamma$ fixed throughout, our initial condition is the stationary state for $\epsilon_{dd} = 0$ obtained by imaginary time propagation of the dGPE [45]. In time, $\epsilon_{dd}$ is slowly ramped up (at a rate $d\epsilon_{dd}/dt = 10^{-3}\omega_\perp$), such that the condensate can slowly traverse the corresponding stationary solutions to high adiabaticity. Further details regarding the simulation are provided in the Supplemental Material.

Figure 3 depicts the density and phase, during a simulation with fixed $\Omega = 3\omega_\perp$ and $\gamma = 1$, as cross-sections at $z = 0$ taken at times when $\epsilon_{dd} = 0.05$, 0.15, and 0.20. For low $\epsilon_{dd}$, the condensate is consistent with the TF stationary solution: the density is smooth and approximates the paraboloid profile of Eq. (5), while the phase approximates the quadrupolar flow of Eq. (6). However, for higher $\epsilon_{dd}$, the density and phase profiles deviate considerably from this form, first visible through a rippling of the density being evident ($\epsilon_{dd} = 0.15$), which later evolves towards a fragmented state ($\epsilon_{dd} = 0.2$). Figure 4 tracks this departure from the TF solution by comparing $\alpha$ as determined from the simulation with that found from Eqs. (7) – (9). While the agreement is excellent at low $\epsilon_{dd}$, i.e. early time, the numerical value begins to fluctuate at $\epsilon_{dd} \approx 0.075$. The amplitude of this fluctuation grows with time, with the numerical solution diverging from the semi-analytical one entirely when $\epsilon_{dd} = 0.17$.

The deviation of the numerically-determined $\alpha$ from the semi-analytical prediction hints at the unstable growth of collective modes of the condensate [46]. This motivates us to return to the TF solutions to study their response to perturbations by means of linearised perturbation analysis [32, 41, 17]. We proceed by writing the time-dependent density and phase as fluctuations about the respective stationary state values:

$$n(r, t) = n_{TF}(r) + \delta n(r, t) ;$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

$$S(r, t) = S_{TF}(r) + \delta S(r, t) .$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

These are substituted into Eq. (3), with terms quadratic (or higher) in the fluctuations being discarded. This results in an eigenvalue problem of the form [32, 33, 40, 11]

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\delta S) = \mathcal{L} (\delta n) ,$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

where the explicit expression for the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is specified in the Supplemental Material. The solutions of Eq. (18) are collective oscillations, and their respective
eigenvalues obey
\[
\frac{\delta S(r, t)}{\delta n(r, t)} = e^{\lambda} \left( \frac{\delta S(r)}{\delta n(r)} \right) : \mathcal{L} \left( \frac{\delta S(r)}{\delta n(r)} \right) = \lambda \left( \frac{\delta S(r)}{\delta n(r)} \right).
\]
(19)

Examining the spectra of Eq. (19) allows for a qualitative understanding of the stability of the condensate with respect to collective modes. If a mode, indexed by \( i \), features \( \text{Re}(\lambda_i) > 0 \), its amplitude grows exponentially and ultimately overwhelms the TF stationary solution. Thus, a stationary state is dynamically stable only if the real components of its entire spectrum is negative or zero.

Equation (19) may be diagonalized numerically over \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) by utilizing a polynomial basis \( \{x^p y^q z^r\} \) for \( \delta S(r) \) and \( \delta n(r) \) \( \text{[52 11]} \). Fluctuations of order \( p + q + r = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \) represent monopolar, dipolar and quadrupolar modes respectively, and so on \( \text{[48]} \); a rich variety of collective modes, including breathing and scissors modes, have been observed in several dipolar BEC experiments \( \text{[46]} \). Due to the inability of a numerical diagonalization scheme to explore the infinite dimensional space of polynomials, it is necessary to impose a truncation of the form \( p + q + r \leq N_{\text{max}} \). However, we note that reducing the degree of the Hilbert space truncation, i.e. increasing \( N_{\text{max}} \), does not modify any eigenvalues corresponding to modes with an order less than \( N_{\text{max}} \), but merely increases the dimension of the truncated space of modes available to us. If, at a given point in parameter space, the diagonalization of Eq. (19) with respect to fluctuations of order less than \( N_{\text{max}} \) yields at least one eigenvalue with a positive real component, it is thus sufficient to claim that the condensate is dynamically unstable up to linear order in the fluctuations.

We limit our analysis to the regions of parameter space explored in Figs. 1 and 4. As several modes might be unstable at a given point in parameter space, we merely work with the eigenvalue with the largest positive, real component, denoted by \( \lambda_0 \). Figure 5 plots \( \lambda_0^{1/4} \) as a function of \( \Omega \) and \( \epsilon_{\text{dd}} \) with \( \gamma = 1 \) and \( N_{\text{max}} = 13 \). The prevalence of real, positive eigenvalues for \( \epsilon_{\text{dd}} > 0 \) indicates the existence of a dynamical instability. Note that black corresponds to \( \sqrt{\lambda_0} = 0 \). The inset takes a cross-section at \( \Omega = 3\omega_\perp \), corresponding to Figs. 3 and 4 and plots \( \lambda_0 \), showing that \( \lambda_0 > 0 \forall \epsilon_{\text{dd}} > 0 \).

Resonance is generally utilised to tune \( \epsilon_{\text{dd}} \) to be slightly lower than 1 \( \text{[4]} \). Figure 4 shows that for \( \Omega/\omega_\perp = 6 \) the dynamical instability manifests itself over a timescale of \( 1/\omega_\perp \) in a cylindrically symmetric trap. Decreasing \( \Omega \) increases the timescale for manifestation of the instability.

Our method does not allow for direct modelling of the experimental report of rotationally-tuned dipolar BECs by Tang et al. \( \text{[30]} \), since the relevant trap is anisotropic in the laboratory frame. This would preclude the existence of stationary states in the rotating frame, which form the basis of our analysis. However, our formalism does describe a dipolar BEC in a cylindrically symmetric harmonic trap, with the radial trapping frequency matching the\( \text{average} x-y \) trapping frequency of that experiment. Therefore, we expect that accounting for the trapping ellipticity in the \( x-y \) plane would amount to a correction to the results obtained via our formalism. In this approximation, the timescale of the experiment is of the order of the typical timescale that we predict for the onset of the instability which, consequently, may not have fully manifested itself during the experimental observations. Nevertheless, the enhanced dissipation observed in the experiment may be linked to the onset of this instability and thus warrants further study. We also note that the considerable deviation from the theoretically predicted TF aspect ratio in the time-of-flight measurement for \( \varphi = \pi/2 \), the angle explored in our study, may be due to the presence of the instability.

In this work, we have examined the rotational tuning of harmonically-trapped dipolar BECs, explicitly ac-
Throughout the paper, a trapping potential of the form
\[ V_T(r) = \frac{m\omega^2}{2}(x^2 + y^2 + \gamma^2 z^2) \]
is considered.

We work in the hydrodynamic formalism, obtained by recasting \( \psi \) in terms of the number density, \( n \), and phase, \( S \), of the condensate:
\[ \psi(r, t) = \sqrt{n(r, t)} \exp[iS(r, t)], \tag{A5} \]
The density \( n \) is normalized to the condensate number, \( N \), via \( \int d^3r n(r) = N \). Similarly, stationary solutions of the dGPE obey
\[ \psi(r, t) = \psi(r, t = 0) \exp(-i\mu t/\hbar), \tag{A6} \]
where \( \mu \) represents the condensate’s chemical potential. A consequence of this reformulation is the identification of the laboratory-frame velocity field, \( \mathbf{v} \), with
\[ \mathbf{v} = \frac{hS}{m}. \tag{A7} \]

By substituting Eqs. (A5) and (A7) into the dGPE, we obtain the dipolar superfluid hydrodynamic equations:
\[ m \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} = -\nabla \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + V_T + V_{\text{int}} - m \mathbf{v} \cdot (\Omega \times \mathbf{r}) \right] + \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2 m \sqrt{n}} \right) \nabla \sqrt{n}, \tag{A8} \]

\[ \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [n (\mathbf{v} - \Omega \times \mathbf{r})]. \tag{A9} \]

In the Thomas-Fermi (TF) limit \[38\], where the zero-point kinetic energy of the condensate is negligible, we ignore the ‘quantum pressure term’ proportional to \( \nabla^2(\sqrt{n})/\sqrt{n} \) in Eq. (A8), resulting in an Euler-like equation,
\[ m \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} = -\nabla \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + V_T + V_{\text{int}} - m \mathbf{v} \cdot (\Omega \times \mathbf{r}) \right]. \tag{A10} \]

Initially, we seek to find stationary solutions to Eq. (A9) and (A10), i.e. \( \partial_t \mathbf{v} = \partial_t n = 0 \). Combining this condition with Eq. (A6) and (A7) yields
\[ \mu = \frac{m}{2} \left[ \mathbf{v}^2 + \omega_x^2 (x^2 + y^2) + \gamma^2 z^2 \right] + V_{\text{int}} - m \mathbf{v} \cdot (\Omega \times \mathbf{r}), \tag{A11} \]
\[ \nabla \cdot [n (\mathbf{v} - \Omega \times \mathbf{r})] = 0. \tag{A12} \]

In the TF limit, the density, \( n_{\text{TF}} \), is of the form
\[ n_{\text{TF}}(r) = n_0 \left( 1 - \frac{x^2}{\kappa_x^2 R_x^2} - \frac{y^2}{\kappa_y^2 R_y^2} - \frac{z^2}{R_z^2} \right), \tag{A13} \]
where
\[ n_0 = \frac{15N}{8\pi \kappa_x \kappa_y R_z^2}, \tag{A14} \]
is the peak density, occurring at \( r = 0 \). For the phase, \( S_{\text{TF}} \), a quadrupolar ansatz of the form \[31\] \[32\]
\[ S_{\text{TF}} = (maxy - \mu)/\hbar, \tag{A15} \]
corresponding to a velocity
\[ \mathbf{v} = a \nabla (xy) = a(y \dot{x} + x \dot{y}), \]  
(A16)
is appropriate. Substituting Eq. (A13) and (A16) into (A12) yields a stationary solution condition for the velocity field amplitude, \( a \), in terms of \( \kappa_x \) and \( \kappa_y \):
\[ \frac{\alpha + \Omega}{\kappa_x^2} + \frac{\alpha - \Omega}{\kappa_y^2} = 0 \Rightarrow a = \frac{\kappa_x^2 - \kappa_y^2}{\kappa_x^2 + \kappa_y^2} \Omega. \]  
(A17)
Recasting \( V_{\text{int}} \) in the equivalent form
\[ V_{\text{int}}(r, t) = g(1 - \epsilon_{\text{dd}}) n(r, t) - 3g\epsilon_{\text{dd}} (\mathbf{e} \cdot \nabla)^2 \phi(r, t), \]  
(A18)
\[ \phi(r, t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^3r' \frac{n(r', t)}{|r - r'|}, \]  
(A19)
where \( \beta_{ijk} \) are functions of \( \kappa_x \) and \( \kappa_y \), and are specified via
\[ \beta_{ijk}(\kappa_x, \kappa_y) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{d\chi}{(\kappa_x^2 + \chi)^{i+\frac{1}{2}}(\kappa_y^2 + \chi)^{j+\frac{1}{2}}(1 + \chi)^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}. \]  
(A21)
The solution of Eq. (A11), via Eq. (A13), (A16), (A18) and (A20), yields the stationary state Thomas-Fermi density,
\[ n_{\text{TF}}(r) = \frac{\mu - m}{2} \left( \frac{\omega_x^2 + \omega_y^2 + \gamma^2 \omega_z^2}{g(1 - \epsilon_{\text{dd}})} \right) + \frac{3\epsilon_{\text{dd}}n_0 \kappa_x \kappa_y (3\beta_{100} \omega_x^2 + \beta_{110} \omega_y^2 + \beta_{101} \omega_z^2 - \beta_{100} R_z^2)}{2(1 - \epsilon_{\text{dd}}) R_z^2}, \]  
(A22)
with dressed trapping frequencies, \( \tilde{\omega}_x \) and \( \tilde{\omega}_y \), given by
\[ \tilde{\omega}_x^2 = \omega_x^2 + \alpha^2 - 2\alpha \Omega, \]  
(A23)
\[ \tilde{\omega}_y^2 = \omega_y^2 + \alpha^2 + 2\alpha \Omega. \]  
(A24)
By comparing the coefficients of \( x^2, y^2, z^2 \) in Eq. (A13) and (A22), we find that
\[ \kappa_x^2 = \frac{1}{\zeta} \left( \frac{\omega_x \gamma}{\omega_x} \right)^2 \left[ 1 + \epsilon_{\text{dd}} \left( \frac{9}{2} \kappa_x^3 \kappa_y \beta_{200} - 1 \right) \right], \]  
(A25)
\[ \kappa_y^2 = \frac{1}{\zeta} \left( \frac{\omega_y \gamma}{\omega_y} \right)^2 \left[ 1 + \epsilon_{\text{dd}} \left( \frac{3}{2} \kappa_y^3 \kappa_x \beta_{110} - 1 \right) \right], \]  
(A26)
\[ R_z^2 = \frac{2g n_0}{m \gamma^2 \omega_z^2 \zeta}, \]  
(A27)
\[ \zeta = 1 + \epsilon_{\text{dd}} \left( \frac{3}{2} \kappa_x \kappa_y \beta_{101} - 1 \right). \]  
(A28)
Substituting Eq. (A25) and (A26) into Eq. (A17) also yields
\[ 0 = (\alpha + \Omega) \left[ \left( \frac{\omega_x \gamma}{\omega_x} \right)^2 \frac{9}{2} \epsilon_{\text{dd}} \kappa_x \kappa_y \gamma^2 \beta_{200} \right] \frac{1}{\zeta} + (\alpha - \Omega) \left[ \left( \frac{\omega_y \gamma}{\omega_y} \right)^2 \frac{3}{2} \epsilon_{\text{dd}} \kappa_y \kappa_x \gamma^2 \beta_{110} \right] \frac{1}{\zeta}. \]  
(A29)
Equations (A25), (A26) and (A29), together with Eq. (A28), fully specify the shape of the stationary TF density, via \( \kappa_x \) and \( \kappa_y \), and the corresponding laboratory-frame velocity field, via \( \alpha \). It is clear that the parameters \( g \) and \( N \) enter the dimensions of the condensate through only the TF radius \( R_z \), and do not affect the velocity field, \( \mathbf{v} \), at all. These equations are subsequently solved self-consistently to yield \( \alpha, \kappa_x, \) and \( \kappa_y \) for a given choice.
of Ω/ω⊥, γ and εdd.

APPENDIX B: DERIVATION OF THE OPERATOR DEFINING THE PROPAGATION OF LINEAR PERTURBATIONS

We write the time-dependent density and phase as fluctuations about the respective stationary state values:

\[ n(r, t) = n_{TF}(r) + δn(r, t); \quad S(r, t) = S_{TF}(r, t) + δS(r, t). \] (A30)

(A31)

Subsequently, Eqs. \( A30 \) and \( A31 \) are substituted into Eq. \( A9 \) and \( A10 \), which are linearized by discarding all terms which are higher than linear order in \( δn \) and \( δS \). This results in a system of coupled, first-order equations, given as

\[ \frac{∂}{∂t} \left( \begin{array}{c} δS \\ δn \end{array} \right) = \mathcal{L} \left( \begin{array}{c} δS \\ δn \end{array} \right), \] (A32)

where

\[ \mathcal{L} = -\left( \frac{k}{m} \nabla \cdot (n_{TF} \nabla) \right) \frac{g}{k} \left( 1 + ε_{dd} \tilde{R} \right), \] (A33)

with

\[ \tilde{v}_c = \nabla - Ω \times r \] (A34)

and

\[ \tilde{R} [δn] = -\frac{3}{4π} \frac{∂^2}{∂s^2} \int d^3s \frac{δn(s, t)}{|r - s|} - δn. \] (A35)

Note that in Eq. \( A35 \), \( Γ \) is defined only as the domain in which the unperturbed density, \( n_{TF} \), is positive, i.e. the ellipsoid whose semi-axes are given by \( R_x, R_y, \) and \( R_z \). We do not extend the domain \( Γ \) to \( Γ = R^3 \setminus \{ n_{TF} + δn < 0 \} \), as the domain extension itself represents an effect proportional to \( δn \), and so integrating the function \( δn||r - r'| \) over the domain extension would amount to considering \( O(δn^2) \) effects [38][39].

In the main paper, we specify a basis for \( δS \) and \( δn \), of the form \( \{ x^iy^jz^k \} : i + j + k < N_{max} \), for diagonalizing \( \mathcal{L} \). An extensive discussion on computing the integrals that arise from substituting elements of this basis for \( δn \) in Eq. \( A35 \) is given in Appendix B of van Bijnen, et al. [18]. To determine the spectrum for a given choice of \( Ω/ω⊥, γ \) and \( ε_{dd} \), we first solve self-consistently for the stationary solutions as specified by Eqs. \( A25 \), \( A26 \) and \( A29 \). These stationary solutions are then used to determine \( \mathcal{L} \) and diagonalization is subsequently carried out to yield the corresponding spectrum.

APPENDIX C: DETAILS OF NUMERICAL SET-UP

We numerically solve the dGPE on a 192^3 grid with spatial step \( d = 0.15\sqrt{\hbar/(mω⊥)} \approx 0.15\frac{d}{s} \) and temporal step \( Δt = 0.004ω⊥^{-1} \). We use the ADI-TSSP method [50], which is an extension of the common split-step Fourier method to incorporate rotation. In order to reduce the effects of alias copies induced by fast Fourier transform algorithms we employ a spherical cut-off to the dipolar effects of alias copies induced by fast Fourier transform.

As long as we choose \( R_c > L \), where \( L \) is the system size, this potential is physically reasonable. The analytical Fourier transform is [51]

\[ \tilde{U}^{R_{dd}}_c(k) = \frac{C_{dd}}{3} \left[ 1 + \frac{3cos(R_k)}{R_k^2} - \frac{3sin(R_k)}{R_k^3} \right] \times (3cos^2θ_k - 1), \] (A37)

where \( θ_k \) is the angle between \( k \) and the direction of the dipoles.

In order to simulate one run we employ the following procedure. At \( t = 0 \), the stationary state for \( ε_{dd} = 0 \), and fixed \( \{ Ω/ω⊥, γ, N \} \), is obtained by evolving the dipolar GPE in imaginary time [45]. For \( t > 0 \), the real-time evolution of the dipolar GPE is accompanied by an increase of \( ε_{dd} \) increased at a rate \( dε_{dd}/dt = 10^{-3}ω⊥ \), allowing the realisation of stationary solutions at finite values of \( ε_{dd} \).

To model random external symmetry-breaking perturbations, which may shift the condensate state away from the stationary state in an experimental scenario, the condensate density is modified at the initial timestep with the addition of a random, local perturbation of up to 5% of the density at each spatial grid point.


[41] R. M. W. van Bijnen, A. J. Dow, D. H. J. O’Dell, N. G. Parker, and A. M. Martin, Exact Solutions and Sta-


