

Mean-field dynamics of a Bose Josephson junction in an optical cavity

J. M. Zhang, W. M. Liu, and D. L. Zhou

*Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics,
Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100080, China.*

Abstract

We study the mean-field dynamics of a Bose Josephson junction which is dispersively coupled to a single mode of a high-finesse optical cavity. An effective classical Hamiltonian for the Bose Josephson junction is derived and its dynamics is studied in the perspective of phase portrait. It is shown that the strong condensate-field coupling does alter the dynamics of the Bose Josephson junction drastically. The possibility of coherent manipulating and *in situ* observation of the dynamics of the Bose Josephson junction is discussed.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Lm, 37.10.Vz, 42.50.Pq, 45.20.Jj

Cavity quantum electrodynamics has now grown into a paradigm in the study of matter-field interaction. To tailor the atom-field coupling effectively, high degree of control over the center-of-mass motion of the atoms are essential. Although previous works have focused on the few-atom level [1, 2, 3], recently, a great step was made as two groups succeeded independently in coupling a Bose-Einstein condensate to a single cavity mode [4, 5]. This opens up a new regime in both the fields of cavity quantum electrodynamics and ultracold atoms. In the condensate, all the atoms occupy the same motional mode, and couple identically to the cavity mode, thus realizing the Dicke model [6] in a broad sense. As shown by these experiments, the condensate is quite robust, it would not be destroyed by its interaction with the cavity mode.

In this paper, we investigate the mean-field dynamics of a Bose Josephson junction (BJJ), which is coupled to a driven cavity mode. This extends our previous work to the many-atom case [7]. The system may be constructed by splitting a Bose Einstein condensate, which couples to a single cavity mode, into two weakly linked condensates [8, 9, 10]. We confine to the low excitation and large detuning limit, so that the atomic spontaneous emission can be neglected. The effect of the strong coupling between the atoms and the field, seen by the field, is to shift the cavity resonance frequency and hence modifies the field intensity. In contrast to the single condensate case, we now have two atomic modes, which may couple with different strengths to the cavity mode. Consequently, the field dynamics is coupled to the tunneling dynamics of the BJJ, and vice versa.

The Hamiltonian of the system consists of three parts:

$$H = H_a + H_f + H_{int}. \quad (1)$$

H_a is the canonical Bose Josephson junction Hamiltonian in the two-mode approximation ($\hbar = 1$),

$$H_a = -\Omega(b_1^\dagger b_2 + b_2^\dagger b_1) + \frac{V}{2}(b_1^\dagger b_1^\dagger b_1 b_1 + b_2^\dagger b_2^\dagger b_2 b_2), \quad (2)$$

where b_1^\dagger , b_2^\dagger (b_1 , b_2) create (annihilate) an atom in the left and right trap respectively. Ω is the tunneling matrix element between the two modes, while V denotes the repulsive interaction strength between a pair of atoms in the same mode. H_f is the single-mode field Hamiltonian,

$$H_f = \omega_c a^\dagger a + \eta(t)e^{-i\omega_p t} a + \eta^*(t)e^{i\omega_p t} a^\dagger, \quad (3)$$

where ω_c , ω_p are the cavity mode frequency and pump frequency respectively, and $\eta(t)$, the amplitude of the pump, is a slowly varying parameter in the sense that $|\dot{\eta}/\eta| \ll \omega_p$. In the limit of large detuning [11] and weak pump, the atom field interaction is of the dispersive nature, and the two-level atoms can be treated as scalar particles with the upper level being adiabatically eliminated. Under the two-mode approximation for the atoms, the interaction between the atoms and the cavity mode is [12],

$$H_{int} = U_0 a^\dagger a (J_1 n_1 + J_2 n_2), \quad (4)$$

where $U_0 = g^2/(\omega_c - \omega_a)$ is the potential per photon an atom feels at an antinode, g being the atom-photon coupling strength at an antinode. The two dimensionless parameters J_1, J_2 reflect the overlaps between the atomic modes with the cavity mode [7]. $n_1 = b_1^\dagger b_1$ ($n_2 = b_2^\dagger b_2$) counts the atoms in the left (right) trap. The term H_{int} has a simple interpretation, from the point of view of the cavity mode, its frequency is renormalized; while from the point of view of the atom ensemble, the trapping potential is tilted.

According to the Heisenberg's equation, we have

$$i\dot{b}_1 = -\Omega b_2 + V b_1^\dagger b_1 b_1 + J_1 U_0 a^\dagger a b_1, \quad (5a)$$

$$i\dot{b}_2 = -\Omega b_1 + V b_2^\dagger b_2 b_2 + J_2 U_0 a^\dagger a b_2, \quad (5b)$$

$$i\dot{a} = [\omega_c + U_0(J_1 n_1 + J_2 n_2)] a - i\kappa a + \eta(t) e^{-i\omega_p t}. \quad (5c)$$

Note that in Eq. (5c) we have put in the term $-i\kappa a$ to take into account the cavity loss, with κ being the cavity loss rate. Under the mean-field approximation, we treat the operators b_1 , b_2 , and a as classical quantities, $b_1 \sim \sqrt{N_1} e^{i\theta_1}$, $b_2 \sim \sqrt{N_2} e^{i\theta_2}$, $a \sim \alpha$. N_1, N_2 are respectively the numbers of atoms in the left and right condensates, and θ_1, θ_2 are their phases.

It is clear from Eq. (5c) that the relaxation time scale of the cavity mode is of order $1/\kappa$, which is much shorter than the plasma oscillation period of a bare Bose Josephson junction [13], which is of order $1/\Omega$. In fact, the typical values of κ of high-finesse optical cavities are of order $2\pi \times 10^6$ Hz, while the experimentally observed Ω is of order $2\pi \times 10 \sim 2\pi \times 10^2$ Hz [9]. This implies that the cavity field follows the motion of the condensates adiabatically [14], thus from Eq. (5c) we solve

$$\langle a \rangle = \alpha(t) = \frac{\eta(t) e^{-i\omega_p t}}{i\kappa + (\omega_p - \omega_c - U_0(J_1 N_1 + J_2 N_2))}, \quad (6)$$

and the photon number is

$$\langle a^\dagger a \rangle = |\alpha(t)|^2 = \frac{|\eta(t)|^2}{\kappa^2 + (\Delta - \delta U_0(N_1 - N_2)/2)^2}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Delta = \omega_p - \omega_c - (J_1 + J_2)(N_1 + N_2)/2$ and $\delta = J_1 - J_2$ is the coupling difference between the two atomic modes to the cavity mode. We then see that for fixed parameters, such as ω_p , ω_c , J_1 , J_2 , and total atom number $N = N_1 + N_2$, the photon number depends only on the atom population difference between the two traps. Moreover, the motion of the cavity mode couples to that of the condensates only in the case that the two traps are placed asymmetrical to the cavity mode such that δ is nonzero. For notational simplicity below, we introduce the dimensionless parameter $z = (N_1 - N_2)/N$ which characterizes the population of the atoms between the two traps. We then rewrite the photon number as

$$f(z, t) = \frac{A(t)}{(z - B)^2 + C^2}, \quad (8)$$

where the three dimensionless parameters are defined as $A(t) = |\eta(t)|^2/[\delta U_0 N/2]^2$, $B = \Delta/[\delta U_0 N/2]$, $C = \kappa/[\delta U_0 N/2]$. We can understand $A(t)$, B , and C as the reduced pumping strength, reduced detuning, and reduced loss rate, respectively.

In the following, we follow closely the line of Refs. [15, 16]. Substituting Eq. (8) into Eqs. (5a) and (5b), we find that the two equations can be rewritten in terms of z and the phase difference $\phi = \theta_2 - \theta_1$ as

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = -\sqrt{1 - z^2} \sin \phi, \quad (9a)$$

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{z}{\sqrt{1 - z^2}} \cos \phi + rz + \frac{\delta U_0}{2\Omega} f(z, t), \quad (9b)$$

where the time has been rescaled in unit of the Rabi oscillation time $1/(2\Omega)$, $2\Omega t \rightarrow t$. The dimensionless parameter $r = NV/(2\Omega) > 0$ measures the interaction strength against the tunneling strength. We further define a Hamiltonian $H_c = H_c(z, \phi, t)$ in which z and ϕ are two conjugate variables, i.e., $\dot{z} = -\frac{\partial H_c}{\partial \phi}$, $\dot{\phi} = \frac{\partial H_c}{\partial z}$. Such a Hamiltonian is

$$H_c(z, \phi, t) = -\sqrt{1 - z^2} \cos \phi + \frac{1}{2} r z^2 + \frac{\delta U_0}{2\Omega} F(z, t), \quad (10)$$

with

$$F(z, t) = \frac{A(t)}{C} \arctan\left(\frac{z - B}{C}\right). \quad (11)$$

The first two terms in Eq. (10) are the Hamiltonian of a bare Bose Josephson junction as was first derived in Refs. [15, 16]. They describe the energy cost due to the phase twisting

between the two condensates and the atom-atom repulsion respectively. The last term reflects that the two traps, which are originally symmetric, are now subjected to an offset determined by the atomic populations. In its nature, this term is similar to the potential an atom feels when passing a cavity adiabatically [17], with the variable z playing the role of the center-of-mass of the atom. The Hamiltonian can be made explicitly time-dependent if the pump strength varies in time. This may offer us a tool to coherently manipulate the motion of a Bose Josephson junction [18]. However, in this work, we concentrate on the case that the pump strength is a constant, $\eta(t) \equiv \eta$, so that the system is autonomous and the Hamiltonian is conserved in time.

As a one degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian system and with the Hamiltonian itself being a first integral, the system is integrable and there is no chaos [19]. The trajectory of the system in the phase space follows the line of constant energy. Thus qualitatively speaking, the dynamics of the system is to a great extent determined by the structure of its phase portrait, or more specifically, the number of stationary points, their properties (saddle, minimum, or maximum), and their distributions. Before proceeding forward, we have some remarks on the structure of the phase space of the system and its implications. On the surface, the Hamiltonian H_c is defined on the rectangular domain, $-1 \leq z \leq 1$, $0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi$. However, physically ϕ is periodic in 2π , and for $z = \pm 1$, ϕ is not well defined, so we should identify $(z, 0)$ with $(z, 2\pi)$ and collapse the lines $(z = \pm 1, \phi)$ to two points [note that $H_c(z, 0) = H_c(z, 2\pi)$, and $H_c(1, \phi) = C_1$, $H_c(-1, \phi) = C_2$, with C_1, C_2 being two constants]. Therefore, the domain of the Hamiltonian or the phase space of the system is homeomorphous to a sphere. The Euler's theorem for a smooth function on a sphere states that the number of minima m_0 , the number of saddles m_1 , and that of maxima m_2 , satisfy the relation $m_0 - m_1 + m_2 = 2$ [20]. This relation can be checked in Fig. 1 below.

In the following, we investigate the dynamics of a Bose Josephson junction uncoupled or coupled to a cavity mode in the perspective of phase portrait. This approach has the advantage that it condenses all the important information into one. Firstly, we find out the stationary points of the system, which are determined by the equations

$$\frac{\partial H_c}{\partial z} = rz + \frac{z}{\sqrt{1-z^2}} \cos \phi + \frac{\tilde{A}}{(z-B)^2 + C^2} = 0, \quad (12a)$$

$$\frac{\partial H_c}{\partial \phi} = \sqrt{1-z^2} \sin \phi = 0, \quad (12b)$$

where $\tilde{A} = \delta U_0 A / (2\Omega)$. Eq. (12b) implies that $\phi = 0$ or $\phi = \pi$. Substituting these two

possible values of ϕ into Eq. (12a), we have two equations of z respectively,

$$f_1(z) = rz + \frac{z}{\sqrt{1-z^2}} + \frac{\tilde{A}}{(z-B)^2 + C^2} = 0, \quad (13a)$$

$$f_2(z) = rz - \frac{z}{\sqrt{1-z^2}} + \frac{\tilde{A}}{(z-B)^2 + C^2} = 0. \quad (13b)$$

The properties of the possible stationary points are determined by the Hessian matrices [19]

$$\begin{aligned} \phi = 0: \quad M_1(z, \phi) &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-z^2} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \phi = \pi: \quad M_2(z, \phi) &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{1-z^2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

If the Hessian matrix is positive-definite (negative-definite), the corresponding stationary point will be a minimum (maximum). These points support small amplitude harmonic oscillations in their neighborhoods. Otherwise, if the Hessian matrix has both positive and negative eigenvalues, the corresponding stationary point will be a saddle point.

For the uncoupled case, $\tilde{A} = 0$, the roots of Eqs. (13a) and (13b) are

$$\begin{aligned} \phi = 0: \quad z &= 0, \\ \phi = \pi: \quad z &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } r < 1, \\ 0, \pm\sqrt{r^2-1}/r, & \text{if } r > 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

By inspection of the corresponding Hessian matrices, we identify the points $(z, \phi) = (0, 0)$ as a minimum, $(z, \phi) = (\pm\sqrt{r^2-1}/r, \pi)$ (for $r > 1$) as two maxima, and $(z, \phi) = (0, \pi)$ a maximum if $r < 1$ or a saddle point if $r > 1$. The transition of the point $(z, \phi) = (0, \pi)$ from a maximum to a saddle, and the split of this old maximum into two new maxima at $r = 1$, mark the onset of running-phase and π -phase self-trapping states [16, 21].

For the coupled case, $\tilde{A} \neq 0$, the roots of Eqs. (13a) and (13b) have to be solved numerically. It is natural to expect that the last term will not only shift the positions of the stationary points, but may also alter the total number of them. Thus the phase portrait of a cavity field coupled BJJ may be quantitatively or even qualitatively different from that of the uncoupled case. A particular example is given in Fig. 1.

As shown in Figs. 1(c) and 1(d), in the specific set of parameters, both the functions $f_1(z)$ and $f_2(z)$ have two new roots when the BJJ couples to the single cavity mode. The two new roots of $f_1(z)$ give rise to a new minimum and a new saddle point along the line $\phi = 0$, while




FIG. 1: (color online). Energy contours of a Bose Josephson junction (a) uncoupled and (b) coupled to a single cavity mode. (c) and (d): Gradient of the energy along the line $\phi = 0$ and $\phi = \pi$, respectively. Zeros of $f_1(z)$ with positive (negative) derivatives correspond to minima (saddle points) of H_c , while zeros of $f_2(z)$ with positive (negative) derivatives correspond to saddle points (maxima). The parameters are $NV/(2\Omega) \equiv r = 3$, $\tilde{A} = 0.02$, $B = -0.65$, $C = 0.07$ [22].

those of $f_2(z)$ correspond to a new maximum and a new saddle point along the line $\phi = \pi$, as clearly visible in Fig. 1(b). Comparing Fig. 1(b) with Fig. 1(a), we see that the cavity mode coupled BJJ has more complex and diverse behaviors than its uncoupled counterpart. For example, the coupled BJJ has now three types of zero-phase modes and three types of π -phase modes, while the uncoupled BJJ owns just one type of zero-phase mode and two types of π -phase modes. We attribute the appearance of new stationary points to the cavity field induced tilt. To appreciate this point, we consider the tilt due to the trap geometric asymmetry. That will contribute a term linear in z to the Hamiltonian H_c [15, 16], and therefore a constant to the functions f_1 and f_2 . As a constant just shifts the graph of a function up or down as a whole, it is ready to convince oneself that no new roots will arise.




FIG. 2: (color online). (a) Population imbalance z and (b) intra-cavity photon number $|\alpha|^2$ (in arbitrary units) versus the reduced time $2\Omega t$. The initial states are $\phi(0) = 0$, $z(0) = -0.75$ (black solid lines) and $z(0) = -0.8$ (red dashed lines). Parameters are the same as in Fig. 1. (c) and (d): trajectories of a Bose Josephson junction (c) coupled or (d) uncoupled to a cavity mode, with the above two different initial states.

We note that the cavity mode plays a dual role here. On one hand, it plays with the condensates interactively and modifies their dynamics effectively; on the other hand, it also carries with it the information of the population of the atoms between the two traps as it leaks out of the cavity. In Figs. 2(a)-(b), we plot the time evolution of the population imbalance and the number of intra-cavity photons (which is proportional to the cavity output). Initially, the phase $\phi(0) = 0$, and $z(0) = -0.75$, or -0.8 respectively. Despite of the minimal difference between the two initial states, the subsequent dynamics is quite different. The outputs of the cavity differ not only in their periods, but also in their detailed temporal structures. The trajectories of the BJJ, as can be read off from Fig. 1(b), are shown in Fig. 2(c). The influence of the cavity field on the dynamics of the BJJ can be

seen by comparing Fig. 2(c) with Fig. 2(d). It is worth noting that this influence may occur at an ultra low intra-cavity photon number [22, 23]. If the parameters can be determined independently, we may infer the population imbalance evolution from the outputs of the cavity. This may offer a different approach than the usual absorption image method to track the tunneling dynamics of two weakly linked Bose-Einstein condensates. Of course, because the atom-field interaction involves only the atom numbers [see Eq. (4) or Eqs. (6) and (7)], no information of the relative phase of the two condensates is contained in the cavity outputs. To fully characterize the dynamics of a BJJ, techniques such as the release-and-interfere [8, 9, 10] are needed.

To conclude, we have derived an effective Hamiltonian for a Bose Josephson junction dispersively coupled to a single cavity mode under the mean-field approximation. The change of the dynamics of the Bose Josephson junction is studied by the means of phase portraits. We gave just one example as in Fig. 1 for illustrative purposes. However, it is natural to expect that, in fact, a large variety of different cases are accessible because there are so many free parameters in the Hamiltonian. Although in this work, as a starting point, we have restricted to the time-independent case, it may be interesting to go into the time-dependent case. By using an external feedback depending on the outputs of the cavity [24], *in situ* observation and manipulation of the state of a Bose Josephson junction may be achieved.

This work was supported by NSF of China under Grant 90406017, 60525417, and 10775176, NKBRFS of China under Grant 2005CB724508, 2006CB921400, 2006CB921206, and 2006AA06Z104.

-
- [1] K. M. Fortier, S. Y. Kim, M. J. Gibbons, P. Ahmadi, and M. S. Chapman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 233601 (2007).
 - [2] A. D. Boozer, A. Boca, R. Miller, T. E. Northup, and H. J. Kimble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 083602 (2006).
 - [3] S. Nußmann, M. Hijlkema, B. Weber, F. Rohde, G. Rempe, and A. Kuhn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 173602 (2005).
 - [4] F. Brennecke, T. Donner, S. Ritter, T. Bourdel, M. Köhl, and T. Esslinger, Nature (London)

- 450**, 268 (2007).
- [5] Y. Colombe, T. Steinmetz, G. Dubois, F. Linke, D. Hunger, and J. Reichel, *Nature (London)* **450**, 272 (2007).
- [6] R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [7] J. M. Zhang, W. M. Liu, and D. L. Zhou, Preprint at <http://cn.arxiv.org/abs/0710.3092> (2007).
- [8] T. Schumm, S. Hofferberth, L. M. Andersson, S. Wildermuth, S. Groth, I. Bar-Joseph, J. Schmiedmayer, and P. Krüger, *Nature Physics* **1**, 57 (2005).
- [9] M. Albiez, R. Gati, J. Fölling, S. Hunsmann, M. Cristiani, and M. K. Oberthaler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010402 (2005).
- [10] Y. Shin, M. Saba, T. A. Pasquini, W. Ketterle, D. E. Pritchard, and A. E. Leanhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 050405 (2004).
- [11] In contrast to the single atom case, here we have to take into account the collective behavior of the atoms. Thus the large detuning condition corresponds to $|\omega_c - \omega_a| \gg g_N = g\sqrt{J_1 N_1 + J_2 N_2}$.
- [12] C. Maschler and H. Ritsch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 260401 (2005).
- [13] Its cavity mode coupled counterpart, may be referred to as a cavity mode “dressed” Bose Josephson junction, see also the concept of “dressed Bose-Einstein condensates” in E. V. Goldstein, E. M. Wright, and P. Meystre, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1223 (1998).
- [14] P. Horak, S. M. Barnett, and H. Ritsch, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 033609 (2000).
- [15] A. Smerzi, S. Fantoni, S. Giovanazzi, and S. R. Shenoy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4950 (1997).
- [16] S. Raghavan, A. Smerzi, S. Fantoni, and S. R. Shenoy, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 620 (1999).
- [17] S. Haroche and J. M. Raimond, in *Cavity Quantum Electrodynamics*, edited by P. R. Berman (Academic, New York, 1994).
- [18] M. S. Chang, Q. Qin, W. Zhang, L. You, and M. S. Chapman, *Nat. Phys.* **1**, 111 (2005).
- [19] H. Dankowicz, *Chaotic Dynamics in Hamiltonian Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997).
- [20] V. I. Arnold, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, translated from the Russian by Richard A. Silverman (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1973), p. 262.
- [21] G. J. Milburn, J. Corney, E. M. Wright, and D. F. Walls, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 4318 (1997).
- [22] We think this set of parameters are experimentally practical. By taking $2\Omega \sim 2\pi \times 10^2$ Hz, $\kappa \sim 2\pi \times 10^6$ Hz, $U_0 \sim 2\pi \times 10^5$ Hz, $\delta \sim 0.1$, $r \sim 10$, $N \sim 10^3$, $A \sim 10^{-4}$, we have $\tilde{A} \sim 0.01$,

$C \sim 0.1$, $|\alpha|^2 \sim 0.01$. Note that B is free by adjusting the cavity pump detuning.

[23] S. Gupta, K. L. Moore, K. W. Murch, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 213601 (2007).

[24] P. W. H. Pinkse, T. Fischer, P. Maunz, and G. Rempe, Nature (London) **404**, 365 (2000).