

# Atom-Pair Tunneling and Quantum Phase Transition in Strong Interaction Regime

J.-Q. Liang,\* J.-L. Liu, W.-D. Li, and Z.-J. Li†

*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Department of Physics,  
Shanxi University, Taiyuan, 030006, China*

We propose a Hamiltonian of ultracold spinless atoms in optical lattices including the two-body interaction of nearest neighbors, which reduces to the Bose-Hubbard model in weak interaction limit. An atom-pair hopping term appearing in the new Hamiltonian explains naturally the recent experimental observation of correlated tunneling in a double-well trap with strong atom-atom interactions and moreover leads to a new dynamic process of atom-pair tunneling where strongly interacting atoms can tunnel back and forth as a fragmented pair. Finally a new dynamics of oscillations induced by the atom-pair tunneling is found in the strong interaction regime, where the Bose-Hubbard model gives rise to the insulator state with fixed time-averaged value of atom-occupation-number only. Quantum phase transitions between two quantum phases characterized by degenerate and non-degenerate ground states are shown to be coinciding with the Landau second-order phase transition theory. In the system of finite atom-number the degeneracy of ground states can be removed by quantum tunneling for the even-number of atoms but not for the odd-number.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Lm, 37.10.Jk, 03.75.Kk, 75.75.+a

## I. INTRODUCTION

The ultracold atom-gas clouds possess many advantages for investigation of quantum phenomena and hence become a test ground of quantum mechanical principles in many

---

\*Electronic address: jqliang@sxu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: zjli@sxu.edu.cn

extraordinary aspects and new prospective regime. Recently rapid advances of experimental techniques in optical traps open up a prospect for the study of quantum phase transition (QPT), for example, from a superfluid to a Mott-insulator[1, 2, 3], where the ratio between tunnel coupling through the interwell barriers and the atom-atom interaction plays a crucial role. Up to date the QPT has been studied only based on the well known and widely applied Bose-Hubbard (BH) Hamiltonian, which in a mean field description leads to coupled equations of population-imbalance and phase difference between two wells for a double-well trap and thus can describe the Josephson oscillation as well as self-trapping of Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs) qualitatively. It is demonstrated that the investigation of experimentally observed non-linear self-trapping[4] could provide a test ground of the mean field description of the BH model in the strong nonlinear regime. Particle tunneling through a classically prohibiting potential barrier is one of the characteristic effects of quantum physics, which has been essentially studied in a single-particle manner. For the many-body case strong interactions between particles may fundamentally alter the tunnel configuration and result in a correlated tunneling, which was explored most recently in ultracold atoms[5, 6]. On the other hand a co-tunneling regime can be achieved in coupled mesoscopic quantum dots, where separate electrons only tunnel in a correlated way[7, 8]. We point out in this paper that the well known BH Hamiltonian based on the hard-core interaction is not able to describe the dynamics of atom-pair tunneling, which is the dominant dynamic effect in strong interaction regime, since the correlated atom-pair tunneling requires long range correlation of wave functions. The BH Hamiltonian, which is valid in a relatively weak interaction regime, should be extended in the strong interacting regime to include the superexchange interactions between atoms on neighboring lattice sites[9, 10]. A peculiar atom-pair hopping term appearing in the new Hamiltonian explains very well the recently reported experimental observation of correlated tunneling and moreover leads to new dynamics in superstrong interaction regime, which has not yet been explored.

The Hamiltonian of second-quantization beyond the on-site approximation is seen to be (see appendix for derivation)

$$\begin{aligned}
 H = & \sum_i \varepsilon_i n_i - \sum_i [J_i - U_3(n_i + n_{i+1} - 1)](a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i) + \frac{U_0}{2} \sum_i n_i(n_i - 1) \\
 & + (U_1 + U_2) \sum_i n_i n_{i+1} + \frac{U_2}{2} \sum_i (a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i a_i)
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $a_i$  is the  $i$ th-site boson annihilation operator and  $n_i = a_i^\dagger a_i$  is the corresponding atom-number operator. The new coupling constants between atoms on neighboring lattice-sites are given by

$$U_1 = \int w_i(x_2)w_{i+1}(x_1)U(|x_1 - x_2|)w_{i+1}(x_1)w_i(x_2)dx_1dx_2,$$

$$U_2 = \int w_i(x_2)w_i(x_1)U(|x_1 - x_2|)w_{i+1}(x_1)w_{i+1}(x_2)dx_1dx_2,$$

and

$$U_3 = \int w_i(x_2)w_{i+1}(x_1)U(|x_1 - x_2|)w_{i+1}(x_1)w_{i+1}(x_2)dx_1dx_2,$$

where  $U(|x_1 - x_2|)$  is the two-atom interaction potential and  $w_i$  denotes Wannier wave functions.  $U_0$  is the usual on-site atom-interaction strength, and the fourth term relating to  $U_1$  denotes the nearest-neighbor repulsion, which has been given in various lattice models in the literature, while the  $U_2$  part is new. The conceptually new transition-matrix element  $U_2/2$  describes obviously the atom-pair tunneling. The atom-atom interaction including the nearest-neighbor results in an additional Josephson tunneling term in relation with the coupling constant  $U_3$  and the atom-number operator  $n_i + n_{i+1} - 1$ . This term as a matter of fact suppresses the interwell hopping. The coupling constants  $U_1$ ,  $U_2$ , and  $U_3$  are much smaller comparing with  $U_0$  and can be evaluated roughly with Gaussian Wannier function and  $\delta$ -function potential. We have

$$U_1 \approx U_2 \approx \epsilon^2 U_0, \quad U_3 \approx \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} U_0,$$

where

$$\epsilon = e^{-\frac{\pi^2 s^{1/2}}{4}}, \quad s = \frac{V}{E_R},$$

with  $V$ ,  $E_R$  being the well depth and lattice recoil energy respectively. Using the experimental values[5] for  $V$  and  $E_R$  we find from the equations above that  $U_1 \approx U_2 \approx 0.02U_0$ . This is in close agreement with the values we take later on with best fitting of the curves with experimental data points  $U_1 = U_2 = 0.018U_0$  (see below).

When a correlated many-body quantum-system is driven by a controllable parameter, the ground-state energy may have a structural change at a critical value of this parameter. This phenomenon is called QPT from a disordered phase to an ordered one obeying the Landau theory with ordinary symmetry breaking. A well-studied example for the QPT is a model described by the Hamiltonian of Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) type, which is originally introduced in nuclear physics as exactly solvable many-body interacting model

and now has been used in a broad range of topics such as spin system and BECs. In the spin system QPT between ferromagnetic phase of long-range magnetic order and disordered paramagnetic phase can occur at a critical value of external magnetic field. We show that the atom-pair tunneling term results in new dynamics of BEC in a double-well trap and a formally same QPT as that in the spin system can be found in the strong atom-atom interaction regime, where the BH Hamiltonian could only give rise to an insulator-phase with a fixed occupation number of atoms in each well. In this paper a new method is adopted for the investigation of QPT, where the many-body system is converted into a giant pseudo-spin which in turn is mapped to a single particle problem with an effective potential. Moreover for the finite-size system with a small number of particles the quantum tunneling may play a significant role and as a consequence the QPT would depend on the number-parity (even or odd) of particles resulted from the topological phase interference of tunneling paths. This peculiar phenomenon is analyzed in section IV.

## II. TWO-ATOM DYNAMICS IN A DOUBLE-WELL TRAP AND EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE OF ATOM-PAIR TUNNELING

The tunneling dynamics of a few atoms loaded in a double-well trap has been studied by varying the interaction strength from weak to strong limit and it is shown for the two-atom case that the character of tunneling changes from Rabi oscillation to a correlated process with increasing interaction[5, 6], namely, when repulsive interactions are strong, two atoms located on one side of the barrier cannot separate, but tunnel together as a pair in a co-tunneling process. As a matter of fact interactions of ultracold atoms can be adjusted experimentally over a wide range via Feshbach resonances which make it possible to explore the limit of strong correlation. A direct observation of the correlated tunneling was reported recently[5] and theoretical analysis has been also presented in terms of two-body quantum mechanics[6]. Moreover it has been demonstrated that if the bosons repel each other infinitely strongly, they can be mapped to noninteracting fermions (the fermionization limit) in the sense that the hard-core interaction mimics the exclusion principle. Near fermionization the strongly interacting atoms tunnel back and forth as a fragmented pair in a double-well trap [6].

For the double-well potential the Hamiltonian Eq.(1) reduces (with a constant-energy

term renormalized to zero) to

$$H = \frac{\Delta}{2}(n_L - n_R) - J(a_L^\dagger a_R + a_R^\dagger a_L) + \frac{U_0}{2}[n_L(n_L - 1) + n_R(n_R - 1)] \\ + (U_1 + U_2)n_L n_R + \frac{U_2}{2}(a_L^\dagger a_L^\dagger a_R a_R + a_R^\dagger a_R^\dagger a_L a_L), \quad (2)$$

where  $\Delta = \varepsilon_L - \varepsilon_R$  is the bias potential between two wells and

$$J = J_0 - (N - 1)U_3$$

with  $J_0$  being the single-atom Josephson coupling constant. The effective Josephson coupling constant  $J$ , which is suppressed by the nearest-neighbor repulsion coupling, can become a negative value for sufficiently large number of atoms  $N$ . In tight-confinement approximation, the quantum state of atoms can be described in a Fock state basis  $|n_L, n_R\rangle$  with  $n_L$  and  $n_R$  being non-negative integers. For one-atom occupation in the two wells corresponding to a filling factor 1/2 of the optical lattice, the Hamiltonian Eq.(2) gives rise to nothing new but the Josephson oscillations (see below). We are interested in the dynamics of two-atom occupation (filling factor 1), where the Fock-state base-vectors are  $|1, 1\rangle$ ,  $|2, 0\rangle$  and  $|0, 2\rangle$ . The states  $|0, 2\rangle$ ,  $|2, 0\rangle$  both couple to the state  $|1, 1\rangle$  by the Josephson-tunnel matrix-element  $J$  and couple each other directly via the matrix element  $U_2$ , the effect of which is vanishingly small in weak interaction regime (roughly speaking  $U_0 < J$ ), where the Josephson tunneling dominates. On the other hand for strong interactions ( $U_0 > J$ ) the energy difference between states  $|0, 2\rangle$  and  $|1, 1\rangle$  is larger than the coupling  $J$  and therefore the Josephson-tunneling induced transition between these states is suppressed due to the strong detuning. However the direct transition between states  $|0, 2\rangle$ , and  $|2, 0\rangle$  via  $U_2$  matrix element is still resonant and gradually becomes the dominant dynamics with continuously increasing interactions. The BH Hamiltonian can only give rise to the first-order transitions between states  $|1, 1\rangle$  and  $|0, 2\rangle$  (or  $|2, 0\rangle$ ), while the transition, for example, from state  $|2, 0\rangle$  to state  $|0, 2\rangle$  is generated only by a second-order transition[5] via the  $J$  matrix element that  $|2, 0\rangle \rightarrow |1, 1\rangle \rightarrow |0, 2\rangle$  with an effective coupling constant  $2J^2/U_0$ , which alone, we will see, is too small to be responsible for the correlated tunneling. We demonstrate in this paper that the correlated tunneling in fact includes both the second-order transition and the atom-pair tunneling via the matrix element  $U_2$ , which is more important dynamic process in the superstrong interaction regime ( $U_0 \gg J$ ) near fermionization. To see this closely we can evaluate the energy eigenvalues  $E_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) and

the corresponding eigenstates  $|\psi_i\rangle$  by direct diagonalization. The two-atom dynamics is studied by solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation  $i\hbar\frac{d}{dt}|\psi(t)\rangle = H|\psi(t)\rangle$  within a three-state description for both the Eq.(2) and BH Hamiltonians. Thus the time-evolution of average position of the two atoms can be evaluated by

$$\langle x \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi(t) | n_L - n_R | \psi(t) \rangle, \quad (3)$$

which characterizes the tunneling dynamics of atoms. We consider the two atoms initially localized on one side of the double wells, for example the left-well. The time-evolutions of average positions are shown in Fig.1 (solid lines) and are compared with the measured time-resolved traces (black dots). If the interaction energy  $U_0$  is much smaller than the tunnel coupling constant  $J$  ( $J/U_0 = 1.5$  in the experiment [5]), the Josephson tunneling is a dominant dynamic mechanism and the average-position oscillation contains more than one frequency component indicating the transition between the two states  $|2, 0\rangle$  and  $|0, 2\rangle$ , which is induced mainly by the second-order process of the Josephson-matrix element [5]. The direct transition between the two states  $|2, 0\rangle$  and  $|0, 2\rangle$  via matrix element  $U_2$ , which is more than two-order lower than the second-order Josephson tunneling, is negligibly small and thus results essentially in no effect seen from Fig.1(a). However, when the interaction energy  $U_0$  increases to reach the interaction-dominated regime ( $J/U_0 = 0.2$  in the experiment [5]), where the Josephson tunneling is suppressed due to the energy difference between states  $|0, 2\rangle$  (or  $|2, 0\rangle$ ) and  $|1, 1\rangle$ , the main dynamic process is the correlated tunneling with frequency  $550\text{Hz}$  (oscillation period  $1.8\text{ms}$ ) seen from the measured two-atom average position [5] (Fig.1(b) black dots), which coincides obviously with the numerical result of the Hamiltonian Eq.(2) (red-solid line in Fig.1(b)) including direct pair-tunneling process between states  $|0, 2\rangle$  and  $|2, 0\rangle$  via the transition element  $U_2$ , which leads to a significant modification of the dynamics. The interaction parameters  $U_1 = U_2 = 0.018U_0$  are determined by the best fitting with the experimental data [5] for a fixed Josephson coupling constant  $J_0$ , which is obtained from the experiment of single-atom occupation [5] (see below). We see that the Josephson tunneling between the states  $|1, 1\rangle$  and  $|0, 2\rangle$  (or  $|2, 0\rangle$ ) is visible as a small modulation with a period of  $400\mu\text{s}$ . The second-order transition  $|0, 2\rangle \rightarrow |1, 1\rangle \rightarrow |2, 0\rangle$  (or  $|2, 0\rangle \rightarrow |1, 1\rangle \rightarrow |0, 2\rangle$ ) with the coupling constant  $2J^2/U_0$ , which is more than four times of the  $U_2$  value in the present case, is indeed the dominant dynamic process as demonstrated in Ref.[5]. It was, however, realized in Ref.[5] that the theoretical results eval-

uated from the BH Hamiltonian with the second-order transition give rise to slightly longer oscillation-period of average position and lower oscillation amplitude (Fig.1(b), blue-dash line) than the experimental data (black dots[5]). This deviation although small is crucial and was compensated by modifying the Josephson coupling constant with an additional 3-10% higher value in Ref.[5]. We show that this problem can be cured by the atom-pair hopping via the transition element  $U_2$ . When the interaction strength increases up to the value that  $J/U_0 = 0.1$ , the atom-pair hopping becomes more important since the coupling constant of second-order transition is about the same value of  $U_2$  and thus the BH Hamiltonian fails to describe tunneling dynamics. The average positions of the two atoms evaluated from Eq.(2) (red-solid line) and BH Hamiltonian (blue-dash line) are given in Fig.1(c) showing a great difference, that the oscillation frequency from Eq.(2) is almost two times higher than that evaluated from the BH Hamiltonian for the transition between states  $|0, 2 \rangle$  and  $|2, 0 \rangle$  (i.e. the oscillation of large amplitude in Fig.1(c)). Increasing the atom-atom interaction the atom-pair hopping introduced in this paper becomes more and more important than the Josephson tunneling and at a critical point  $J = J_0 - (N - 1)U_3 = 0$ , where the Josephson tunneling vanishes, we have the sinusoidal population oscillations between two states  $|2, 0 \rangle$ ,  $|0, 2 \rangle$  induced only by the atom-pair tunneling i.e. the effective Josephson oscillation of atom-pair. We see that atom-pair tunneling becomes the dominant dynamic process and should be observed experimentally.

In addition to the average center-of mass positions the phase relation between two wells is also measured experimentally by a separate interferometric sequence of double-slit matter-wave interference pattern, which can be evaluated by

$$P = \sum_{i,j} \langle a_i a_j^\dagger \rangle e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)} = N(1 + \mathcal{V} \cos[\phi + \mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}_L - \mathbf{r}_R)]) \quad (4)$$

where  $\phi$  is the relative phase between two wells,  $\mathcal{V}$  is the visibility and  $N$  denotes the total number of atoms in the double-well. For a single-atom occupation the experimentally observed signal is still sinusoidal however with a correspondingly lower frequency[5] in the strong interaction regime ( $J/U_0 = 0.2$ ). Both Hamiltonians give rise to the same expected sinusoidal population oscillation between two states  $|1, 0 \rangle$ ,  $|0, 1 \rangle$  with oscillation-period depending only on the Josephson-matrix element  $J = J_0$ . As a comparison the corresponding average center-of mass position, phase and visibility are shown in Fig.2 with black dots representing the experimental data[5] from which Josephson coupling constant  $J_0$  is obtained

$J_0 = 0.55 \times 10^3 Hz \cdot h$ , where  $h$  is the Planck's constant. We see that the two Hamiltonians make no difference in description of dynamic behavior of single-atom occupation seen from the coinciding red (solid) (proposed Hamiltonian) and blue (dash) (BH Hamiltonian) lines.

### III. ATOM-ATOM INTERACTION INDUCED DYNAMICS AND QUANTUM PHASE TRANSITION

Dynamics of cold atoms in a double-well trap has been well studied based on the BH Hamiltonian. The  $\pi$ -phase oscillation, in which the time-averaged value of the phase difference between two wells is equal to  $\pi$ , has been found in the weak interaction limit ( $J \gg U_0$ ). In the strong interaction region ( $U_0 \gg J$ ) the BH Hamiltonian results in the insulator-phase only, where the system is in the fixed atom occupation-number state. We show that the atom-pair tunneling in the Hamiltonian Eq.(2) can lead to a new dynamics of atom occupation-number oscillation, which has not yet been explored. We in this paper provide an analytic investigation based on an effective Hamiltonian of single-particle with canonical variables: the atom-number difference (or population imbalance) and phase difference between the two wells. For the  $N$ -atom occupation (filling factor  $\frac{N}{2}$ ) in the double-well trap we introduce the pseudo-angular momentum operators defined by

$$S_x = \frac{1}{2} (a_L^\dagger a_R + a_R^\dagger a_L), \quad (5)$$

$$S_y = \frac{1}{2i} (a_L^\dagger a_R - a_R^\dagger a_L), \quad (6)$$

and

$$S_z = \frac{1}{2} (n_L - n_R), \quad (7)$$

with the total angular momentum

$$S^2 = \frac{N}{2} \left( \frac{N}{2} + 1 \right).$$

The Hamiltonian Eq.(2) can be written as

$$H = -2JS_x - \Delta S_z + K_1 S_z^2 + K_2 S_x^2, \quad (8)$$

with the parameters given by  $K_1 = U_0 - U_1$ ,  $K_2 = 2U_2$ , which is nothing but a LMG model Hamiltonian[11]. Here we adopt a new method to study the energy spectrum and related



QPT of Hamiltonian Eq.(8). To this end we begin with the Schrödinger equation

$$H\Phi(\phi) = E\Phi(\phi), \quad (9)$$

where  $E$  is the energy eigenvalue to be determined and the generating function is constructed in terms of the spin function of  $S_z$  representation such as

$$\Phi(\phi) = \sum_{m=-s}^s \frac{C_m}{\sqrt{(s-m)!(s+m)!}} e^{im\phi}. \quad (10)$$

in which the pseudo-spin operators have the form of differential operators

$$S_x = s \cos \phi - \sin \phi \frac{d}{d\phi},$$

$$S_y = s \sin \phi + \cos \phi \frac{d}{d\phi},$$

$$S_z = -i \frac{d}{d\phi}.$$

Obviously  $S_z$  and  $\phi$  are two canonical variables describing the atom-number and phase differences respectively between the double wells. In the following we may convert our eigenvalue problem Eq.(9) to an effective single-particle Hamiltonian by making use of a proper unitary transformation and introducing an incomplete elliptic integral coordinate such that

$$x = \int_0^\phi \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi}} = F(\phi, \lambda), \quad (11)$$

where  $F(\phi, \lambda)$  is the incomplete elliptic integral of the first kind with modulus  $\lambda^2 = K_2/K_1$ , and then can achieve an effective single-particle in a quasi-periodic potential  $V(x)$  for the symmetric double-well  $\Delta = 0$ ,

$$\left[ -K_1 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi(x) = E\psi(x), \quad (12)$$

$$V(x) = (a - \lambda^2 V_{\min}) \frac{(cn(x) - \mu)^2}{dn^2(x)}, \quad (13)$$

with

$$V_{\min} = \frac{a(\xi_1 - \xi_2)^2 - b(\xi_1 - \xi_2) + c}{\lambda'^2 + \lambda^2(\xi_1 - \xi_2)^2},$$

$$\xi_1 = \sqrt{\xi_2^2 + \frac{\lambda'^2}{\lambda^2}}, \quad \xi_2 = \frac{1}{b} \left( \frac{a\lambda'^2}{\lambda^2} - c \right),$$

and

$$\mu = \frac{b}{2(a - \lambda^2 V_{\min})},$$

where  $cn(x)$  and  $dn(x)$  denote the Jacobian elliptic functions of modulus  $\lambda^2$  and  $\lambda'^2 = 1 - \lambda^2$ .

Three parameters  $a, b$ , and  $c$  are related to the model parameters given by

$$a = K_2 \frac{N}{2} \left( \frac{N}{2} + 1 \right) - J^2 / K_1,$$

$$b = J(N + 1),$$

and

$$c = \frac{J^2}{K_1}.$$

The effective-Hamiltonian eigenvalue-problem Eq.(12) corresponds to a single-particle of mass  $m = 1/2K_1$  in an effective potential  $V(x)$  plotted in Fig.3, which possesses two degenerate minima located at

$$x_{\pm} = \pm cn^{-1}(\mu) \bmod[4\mathcal{K}(\lambda^2)], \quad (14)$$

respectively, where  $\mathcal{K}(\lambda^2)$  is the complete elliptic integral of the first-kind with modulus  $\lambda^2$ .

The two degenerate minima are separated by the central barrier located at  $x = 0$  with the barrier height given by

$$V_{\max} = (a - \lambda^2 V_{\min})(1 - |\mu|)^2,$$

which can be controlled by the Josephson coupling constant  $J$ . Particularly when the Josephson coupling constant vanishes  $J = 0$ , we have  $\mu = 0$ . the degenerate minima are located at  $x_{\pm}(\mu = 0) = \pm \mathcal{K}(\lambda^2) \bmod[2\mathcal{K}(\lambda^2)]$  and the potential  $V(x)$  becomes periodic. Notice the relation between the elliptic-integral coordinate  $x$  and the phase-angle  $\phi$  the two degenerate ground states correspond to the degenerate  $\pm \frac{\pi}{2} \bmod(\pi)$ -phase states of cold atoms in the double-well trap (Fig.4(a)). The QPT has obvious meaning in a real spin system, in which  $S_i$  ( $i = x, y, z$ ) denote the collective spin-operators. The degenerate  $\pm \frac{\pi}{2} \bmod(\pi)$ -phase states are nothing but the ferromagnetic phase of long range magnetic order (gapless) with two degenerate equilibrium-orientations of the magnetization. When the Josephson coupling constant  $J$  increases the height of center potential-barrier decreases (see Fig.4) and the two-fold degeneracy of the ground state gradually lifts. At a critical point (Fig.4(c))

$$\mu_c = \pm 1 \quad (15)$$

the barriers located at  $x_{b1} = 0 \bmod[4\mathcal{K}(\lambda^2)]$  (corresponding to  $\phi = 0 \bmod(2\pi)$ ) and  $x_{b2} = 2\mathcal{K}(\lambda^2) \bmod[4\mathcal{K}(\lambda^2)]$  (corresponding to  $\phi = \pi \bmod(2\pi)$ ) vanish, and we have the disordered phase called the paramagnetic phase with a energy gap in the spin language, which in our case of cold atoms in a double-well trap indicates zero-and  $\pi$ -phase oscillations. The QPT from the long-range magnetic order to disordered phases is of the second-order coinciding with the Landau second-order phase transition theory, where the dimensionless barrier height

$$h = \frac{V_{\max}}{(a - \lambda^2 V_{\min})} = (1 - |\mu|)^2$$

may be chosen as the order-parameter. The highest value of order-parameter  $h = 1$  ( $\mu = 0$ ) corresponds to the degenerate  $\pm\frac{\pi}{2} \bmod(\pi)$ -phase states i.e. the ferromagnetic phase of two-fold degeneracy and the magnetic order decreases with the decreasing order-parameter  $h$  (increasing Josephson coupling constant  $J$ ). When the order-parameter vanishes  $h_c = 0$  ( $|\mu_c| = 1$ ) by properly adjusting the parameters  $J_0$  and  $N$ , the system approaches the non-degenerate  $0 \bmod(2\pi)$ -phase ( $\mu_c = 1$ ) or  $\pi \bmod(2\pi)$ -phase ( $\mu_c = -1$ ) ground state i.e. the paramagnetic phase in the spin language (Fig.4(c)). The phase-plane portraits corresponding to the classical Hamiltonian of Eq.(12)  $H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(x)$  are plotted in the Fig.4 in comparison with the variation of potential barrier. The closed orbits show the oscillations with fixed average phase-difference between the double-well trap and wavy-open lines indicate atom-number self-trapping. The variation of energy gap as a function of  $J/U_0$  with various  $K_2$  is plotted in Fig.5 showing clearly the smooth second-order phase transition. It is worthwhile to remark that the entirely new method, which converts the many-body system to an effective single-particle in a potential field, has obvious advantage to study the dynamics and QPT of a complex system in a simple and visible way.

#### IV. QUANTUM TUNNELING AND ATOM-NUMBER PARITY EFFECT

In the previous section the dynamics of cold atoms trapped in a double-well potential has been investigated in terms of two conjugate variables, i.e. the atom-number-occupation difference and the relative phase in the elliptic integral coordinate  $x$ . In the case of large atom-number  $N$  quantum tunneling effect becomes negligibly small, however for small  $N$ , the quantum tunneling has to be taken into account. We demonstrate an atom number-parity effect of tunneling resulted from the boundary condition of the wave function  $\Phi(\phi)$ ,

which is obviously periodic for even-number of  $N$  (and therefore the pseudo-spin  $s = \frac{N}{2}$  is integer) and antiperiodic for odd-number

$$\Phi(\phi + 2\pi) = \Phi(\phi)e^{i2\pi s}, \quad (16)$$

while the boundary condition of wave function  $\psi(x)$  in the elliptic integral coordinate  $x$  is

$$\psi(x + 4\mathcal{K}) = (-1)^{2s}\psi(x). \quad (17)$$

We begin with the transition amplitude, i. e. the Feynman propagator, between two degenerate vacua  $x_{\pm}$  induced by the quantum tunneling, which can be studied by the instanton technique

$$\langle x_+(T)|x_-(-T) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\{x\} e^{-S_E} \quad (18)$$

where

$$S_E = \int_{-T}^T \mathcal{L}_E d\tau \quad (19)$$

is Euclidian action defined with the imaginary time  $\tau = it$  and the Euclidian Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_E = \frac{1}{2}m\left(\frac{dx}{d\tau}\right)^2 + V(x). \quad (20)$$

The Euclidian Feynman propagator can be evaluated in terms of stationary-phase perturbation-method, in which the zero-order perturbation comes from the action of classical trajectory of pseudo-particles in the barrier region called the instantons. The explicit instanton solution of the classical equation of motion

$$m\frac{d^2x}{d\tau^2} = \frac{dV(x)}{dx},$$

is found in our case as

$$x_1(\tau) = tn^{-1}\left(\frac{2\eta \tanh\left(\frac{\omega\tau}{2}\right)}{1 - \eta^2 \tanh^2\left(\frac{\omega\tau}{2}\right)}\right), \quad (21)$$

$$x_2(\tau) = tn^{-1}\left(\frac{2\eta^{-1} \tanh\left(\frac{\omega\tau}{2}\right)}{1 - \eta^{-2} \tanh^2\left(\frac{\omega\tau}{2}\right)}\right), \quad (22)$$

which exist in the large (counterclockwise rotation) and small (clockwise rotation) barriers respectively (see Fig.3), where  $tn(x) = sn(x)/cn(x)$  is the Jacobian elliptic function,  $\eta = \sqrt{(1 - \mu)/(1 + \mu)}$ , and

$$\omega = \sqrt{4K_1(a - \lambda^2 V_{\min})} \quad (23)$$

is the oscillation frequency at the bottom of the potential well. Taking into account of contributions of both instantons  $x_1(\tau)$  and  $x_2(\tau)$  with the corresponding boundary conditions Eq.(17) the Feynman propagator is obtained up to the one-loop approximation and then the ground state tunnel splitting is abstracted as

$$\Delta\varepsilon_0 = Qe^{-\rho}\sqrt{2(\cosh\gamma + \cos 2\pi s)} \quad (24)$$

where

$$Q = \frac{2^{5/2}(a - \lambda^2 V_{\min})^{3/4}}{\sqrt{[1 - \lambda^2(1 - \mu^2)]\pi}},$$

$$\rho = \sqrt{\frac{a - \lambda^2 V_{\min}}{K_1 \lambda^2}} \ln \frac{1 + \lambda\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}}{1 - \lambda\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}},$$

and

$$\gamma = \frac{2\mu}{\lambda'} \sqrt{\frac{a - \lambda^2 V_{\min}}{K_1}} \arctan \frac{\lambda' \sqrt{1 - \mu^2}}{\mu}.$$

To see the particle-number parity effect clearly we consider the case of vanishing Josephson coupling constant  $J = 0$  and thus  $\mu = \gamma = 0$ . For even-number of atoms ( $s$  is integer) the tunnel splitting is

$$\Delta\varepsilon_0 = 2Qe^{-\rho},$$

however the tunnel splitting vanishes for odd-number of atoms ( $s$  is half-integer) called the quench of quantum tunneling due to the quantum phase interference of tunnel paths with the antiperiodic boundary condition of wave function Eq.(17). Thus the degeneracy of  $\pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ -phase states cannot be removed by quantum tunneling. The tunnel splitting as a function of  $J$  is shown in Fig.6 for odd- (a) and even-number (b)  $N$  respectively.

## V. CONCLUSION

We conclude that the BH Hamiltonian in the superstrong interaction regime ought to be extended to include the two-body interaction of nearest neighbors, which results in a fundamental phenomenon of many-body system, namely the atom-pair tunneling. New dynamics of various oscillations depending on the competition between the Josephson coupling constant  $J$  and interaction constant  $U_0$  is found in superstrong interaction regime, where the BH Hamiltonian gives rise to the fixed atom-occupation-number state only. The QPT and the critical transition point are analyzed analytically in terms of the potential-field method,

which allows us to convert the system of  $N$  cold-atoms in a double-well trap to an effective single-particle in a quasi-periodic potential in the elliptic integral coordinate. The new oscillation states and related QPT should be observed in practical experiment.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Nature Science Foundation of China(Grant No. 10775091).

### APPENDIX A:

The two-body interaction Hamiltonian in the second-quantization formulation is

$$H_{int} = \frac{1}{2} \int \Psi^\dagger(x_2)\Psi^\dagger(x_1)U(|x_1 - x_2|)\Psi(x_1)\Psi(x_2)dx_1dx_2, \quad (\text{A1})$$

with  $\Psi(x)$  being the field operator of ultracold atom-gas clouds, which in the lattice-mode expansion[12, 13] such that

$$\Psi(x) = \sum_i^{N_L} a_i w_i(x) \quad (\text{A2})$$

becomes

$$H_{int} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k,l}^{N_L} a_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger a_k a_l \int w_i(x_2)w_j(x_1)U(|x_1 - x_2|)w_k(x_1)w_l(x_2)dx_1dx_2, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where four sums over the lattice sites are independent and  $N_L$  denotes the total number of lattice sites. In the strongly interacting regime the sum over lattice sites should be extended to include nearest neighbors. The arbitrary sum over lattice sites can be obtained up to the nearest-neighbor approximation as

$$H_{int} \approx H_{int-o} + H_{int-n} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where the first term with all four modes on one-site

$$H_{int-o} = \frac{U_0}{2} \sum_i^{N_L} a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_i a_i = \frac{U_0}{2} \sum_i^{N_L} n_i(n_i - 1) \quad (\text{A5})$$

is the well known on-site approximation in the BH Hamiltonian. The sum over nearest-neighbor can be grouped under two configurations:

$$H_{int-n} = H_{int-n}(2, 2) + H_{int-n}(1, 3),$$

where  $H_{int-n}(2, 2)$  denotes any two-mode on one-site and  $H_{int-n}(1, 3)$  denotes three-mode on one-site. Obviously

$$H_{int-n}(2, 2) = (U_1 + U_2) \sum_i^{N_L} n_i n_{i+1} + \frac{U_2}{2} \sum_i^{N_L} (a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i a_i) \quad (\text{A6})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{int-n}(1, 3) &= \frac{U_3}{2} \sum_i^{N_L} (a_i^\dagger a_{i+1}^\dagger a_{i+1} a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_{i+1}^\dagger a_{i+1} a_i \\ &\quad + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_i a_i + a_i^\dagger a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i a_i + a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} a_i + a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_i a_{i+1}) \\ &= U_3 \sum_i^{N_L} (n_{i+1} + n_i - 1) (a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^\dagger a_i), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

which can be combined with the hopping term in the Hamiltonian Eq.(1).

- 
- [1] M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. Esslinger, T.W. Hänsch, and I. Bloch, *Nature* **415**, 39 (2002).
  - [2] I.B. Spielman, W.D. Phillips, and J.V. Porto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 080404 (2007).
  - [3] T. Stöferle, H. Moritz, C. Schori, M. Köhl, and T. Esslinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 130403 (2004).
  - [4] M. Albiez, R. Gati, J. Fölling, S. Hunsmann, M. Cristiani, and M. K. Oberthaler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010402 (2005).
  - [5] S. Fölling, S. Trotzky, P. Cheinet, M. Feld, R. Saers, A. Widera, T. Müller, and I. Bloch, *Nature*, **448**, 1029 (2007).
  - [6] S. Zöllner, H.-D. Meyer, and P. Schmelcher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 040401 (2008).
  - [7] S. De Franceschi *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 878 (2001).
  - [8] D. M. Zumbühl, C. M. Marcus, M. P. Hanson, and A. C. Gossard, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 256801 (2004).
  - [9] L.-M. Duan, E. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 090402 (2003).
  - [10] A. B. Kuklov and B. V. Svistunov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 100401 (2003).
  - [11] H.J. Lipkin, N. Meshkov, and N. Glick, *Nucl. Phys. A* **62**, 188 (1965).
  - [12] J.-J. Liang, J.-Q. Liang, and W.-M. Liu, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 043605, (2003).
  - [13] Gh.-S. Paraoanu, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 023607, (2003).

Figure Caption:

Fig.1 (color online)The time-evolution of average position for two-atom occupation in the weakly ( $J/U_0 = 1.5$ ) (a) and strongly ( $J/U_0 = 0.2, 0.1$ ) (b,c) interacting regime. Black dots denote the experimental data, red solid-line is the value evaluated from the proposed Hamiltonian and blue dash-line shows the result from Bose-Hubbard Hamiltonian.

Fig.2 (color online)Average position (a), visibility (b) and phase (c) for single-atom occupation in strong interaction regime ( $J/U_0 = 0.2$ ) with black dots denoting the experimental data. Coinciding red (solid) and blue (dash) lines are the values evaluated from the proposed and Bose-Hubbard Hamiltonians respectively.

Fig.3 Effective potential in elliptic-integral coordinate  $x$  (unit of  $\mathcal{K}$ ) with asymmetric twin barriers and degenerate minima located at  $x_{\pm}$ .  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  denote the clockwise and counterclockwise tunnel paths.

Fig.4 (color online)Phase-plane portraits for  $\mu = 0$  (a),  $1 > \mu > 0$  (b), and  $\mu = 1$  (c) and the variation of potential with respect to  $\mu$ .

Fig.5 (color online)The energy gap in unit of  $K_1$  as a function of  $J$  evaluated by the numerical diagonalization of the Hamiltonian Eq.(8) with  $\Delta = 0$  for the particle number  $N = 20$  and various values of  $K_2$ .

Fig.6 (color online)The energy gap as a function of  $J$  evaluated by the numerical diagonalization of the Hamiltonian for the particle number  $N = 7$  (a) and  $N = 8$  (b).






Fig.1




Fig.2




Fig.3




Fig.4




Fig.5




Fig.6