

Self-sustained Josephson dynamics and self-trapping in supersolids

Aitor Alaña,^{1,2} Michele Modugno,^{1,3,2} Pablo Capuzzi,^{4,5} and D. M. Jezek⁵

¹*Department of Physics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, 48080 Bilbao, Spain*

²*EHU Quantum Center, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, 48940 Leioa, Biscay, Spain*

³*IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, 48009 Bilbao, Spain*

⁴*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Departamento de Física, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina*

⁵*CONICET - Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Física de Buenos Aires (IFIBA), 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina*

(Dated: January 16, 2025)

We explore the self-sustained Josephson junction dynamics in dipolar supersolids, predicting the possibility of self-trapping alongside the experimentally observed Josephson oscillations [Biagioni, *G. et al.*, *Nature* **629**, 773 (2024)]. Using an asymmetric two-mode (ATM) model to describe a triangular dipolar supersolid, validated through Gross-Pitaevskii simulations, we demonstrate that the system's symmetry enables a consistent two-mode mapping despite the presence of seven droplets. Additionally, we show that bringing the system into rotation preserves its ability to sustain the Josephson junction dynamics across its full range, and we assess the robustness of the ATM model under these conditions.

Introduction. Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs) have proven to be a versatile and tunable platform for realizing the Josephson effect [1], a paradigmatic manifestation of macroscopic quantum coherence [2]. The dynamics of Josephson junctions, encompassing both oscillations of the population imbalance around an equilibrium value and self-trapping, have been extensively studied in BECs confined in double-well potentials, both experimentally and theoretically [3–12]. Other configurations, where the junction is self-sustained without the need for an external potential, have also been proposed [13, 14]. Recently, the advent of dipolar supersolids [15–24] has opened fascinating new perspectives in this respect. Notably, self-sustained Josephson oscillations have been observed in a recent experiment involving a quasi one-dimensional geometry with multiple droplets [25]. Additionally, a Josephson junction array model has been used to describe another experiment that probed the response of a dipolar supersolid to an interaction quench, leading to the shattering of global phase coherence [26]. However, the possibility of self-trapping dynamics in the presence of a soft weak link, as in supersolids, has not yet been explored.

The study of Josephson dynamics in BECs confined to double-well potentials has traditionally relied on two-mode models, which provide a simplified description that effectively captures key phenomena such as coherent oscillations and self-trapping [3, 5, 9, 11, 27, 28]. These models most often assume symmetric configurations, where both wells are identical [8, 29]. Asymmetric two-mode (ATM) models, which account for a nonzero equilibrium population imbalance, have also been developed and shown to agree with experiments [30, 31]. In the case of supersolids, the Josephson junction involves multiple interacting droplets, making theoretical descriptions significantly more complex. For example, recent experiments on dipolar supersolids required models with at least six modes to capture the observed dynamics [25].

Nevertheless, the inherent symmetry of certain supersolid configurations, such as triangular arrays of droplets, offers an opportunity to reduce the complexity of these descriptions. Equivalent droplets in such configurations enable a consistent two-mode mapping, even in the presence of multiple droplets, paving the way for a deeper understanding of the system's dynamics.

Supersolids also offer the intriguing possibility of extending Josephson dynamics to rotating systems. In such cases, the evolution of the junction is influenced by spatial phase variations induced by rotation, including the formation of quantized vortices [32–40], which have been experimentally observed in both regular superfluids [41] and supersolids [42]. Additionally, the junction may be affected by dynamical effects unique to rotation [43–45], potentially challenging its stability. As a result, assessing the robustness of Josephson theory in rotating systems is of significant importance. In light of this, in this work we investigate self-sustained Josephson dynamics in dipolar supersolids, focusing on the triangular supersolid as a test case. Using an ATM model validated through Gross-Pitaevskii simulations, we demonstrate the existence of self-trapping dynamics under specific initial conditions. Moreover, we show that the system retains its ability to sustain Josephson dynamics when subjected to rotation, highlighting the robustness of the ATM model despite the added complexity.

System. We consider a triangular configuration comprising a ring of droplets surrounding a central droplet, as schematically shown in Fig. 1. Such a configuration can be realized, for instance, with a dipolar Bose gas composed of $N = 1.1 \times 10^5$ ^{162}Dy atoms trapped by an axially symmetric potential with frequencies $\{\omega_r, \omega_z\} = 2\pi \times \{60, 120\}$ Hz, with the dipoles aligned along the z -axis, as previously investigated in Refs. [36, 40]. For ^{162}Dy , the dipolar scattering length is $a_{dd} = 130a_0$, and the s -wave scattering length is set to $a_s = 92a_0$, where a_0 denotes the Bohr radius. To create a population im-




FIG. 1. Scheme of the Josephson-junctions configuration in the xy plane. The central droplet ($i = 0$) and the six droplets forming the ring are coupled through the constant K , with φ representing the corresponding phase difference.

balance in the system, we introduce an additional external potential composed of a set of Gaussian wells, arranged with the same hexagonal symmetry as the ring of droplets, which we will refer to as the *egg-box* potential. This potential is used to prepare the initial state and is then removed, allowing the system to evolve freely in the harmonic trap. By varying selectively the intensity of the wells acting locally on the central or ring droplets, we can prepare states with larger or smaller imbalances relative to the equilibrium value. The same potential can also be used to conveniently put the system under rotation, as detailed in the Supplemental Material.

Asymmetric two-mode model. We consider that the central and ring droplets are connected by Josephson junctions, with all external droplets behaving identically due to the sixfold symmetry. That is, all the droplets of the ring have the same population and phase at any time, $N_i(t) = N_r(t)$ and $\phi_i(t) = \phi_r(t)$, where $1 \leq i \leq 6$. Hence, one can define only a single phase difference between the centers of the central and the ring droplets $\varphi(t) = \phi_0(t) - \phi_r(t)$ and a single imbalance given by $Z(t) = (6N_r(t) - N_0)/N = 1 - 2n_0(t)$, where $n_0(t) = N_0(t)/N$. Here we neglect the interchange of particles between the droplets and the background density.

The dynamics of the macroscopic variables $Z(t)$ and $\varphi(t)$ can be described by the ATM model as presented in Ref. [30], whose equations of motion can be simplified to

$$\hbar \dot{Z}(t) = -K\sqrt{1-Z^2} \left(\frac{1-2Z_e^2+Z_e Z}{1-Z_e^2} \right) \sin \varphi, \quad (1)$$

$$\hbar \dot{\varphi}(t) = UN(Z-Z_e) + K \frac{(Z-Z_e)(1+2Z_e Z)}{(1-Z_e^2)\sqrt{1-Z^2}} \cos \varphi, \quad (2)$$

where K and U are related to the coupling and interaction energies per particle, respectively (see Fig. 1). The parameter Z_e represents the value of the imbalance at

equilibrium, where $\varphi = 0$. For the non-rotating system, $Z_e \simeq 0.59$ ($n_0 \simeq 0.205$). The above equations can be seen as the equations of motion $\dot{\varphi} = \partial H / \partial Z$, $\dot{Z} = -\partial H / \partial \varphi$ corresponding to the following Hamiltonian,

$$H(Z, \varphi) = \frac{NU}{2}(Z - Z_e)^2 - K\sqrt{1-Z^2} \left[\frac{1-2Z_e^2+Z_e Z}{1-Z_e^2} \right] \cos(\varphi). \quad (3)$$

The dynamics of the system within the phase-space representation is determined by the critical points of the Hamiltonian. Such a set of points consists of a minimum at $(Z_e, 0)$, a saddle at (Z_e, π) , and two maxima near $(|Z| \simeq 1, \pi)$. We recall that (Z, π) and $(Z, -\pi)$ correspond to the same point in the phase space. Then, the phase-space diagram (Z, φ) exhibits Josephson oscillations around the equilibrium point $(Z_e, 0)$. Whereas the self-trapping regime is separated from Josephson oscillations by two curves (Z_c, φ_c) , called separatrices, that pass through the saddle point, and can be numerically found by imposing $H(Z_c, \varphi_c) = H(Z_e, \pi)$. In particular, the value of the imbalances Z_c^\pm for $\varphi_c = 0$ can be roughly approximated by [30],

$$Z_c^\pm \simeq Z_e \pm \sqrt{\frac{4K\sqrt{1-Z_e^2}}{UN}}, \quad (4)$$

where the plus (minus) sign corresponds to the upper (lower) bound for the Josephson oscillations.

Non-rotating system. The different dynamical behaviors predicted by the above model can be explored through GP simulations (for the numerical details, which are standard [40, 46], see the Supplemental Material), by preparing the system with different initial values of the imbalance, $Z(0)$. In all cases, the initial phase difference between the central and ring droplets is set to zero, $\varphi(0) = 0$. The numerical findings for the non-rotating case are summarized in Fig. 2. By initializing the system close to the equilibrium value Z_e , the system reveals clear Josephson oscillations, similar to those reported in Ref. [25], as shown in the central panels of the figure. The phase oscillates around $\varphi = 0$, and the turning points of φ correspond to the points where $Z - Z_e = 0$. By increasing the initial offset $|Z - Z_e|$, we observe a self-trapping behavior, with Z oscillating without ever reaching Z_e . This may be seen for $Z > Z_c^+$ and $Z < Z_c^-$, top and bottom panels, respectively.

In the rightmost panel of Fig. 2, we present the phase diagram in the (Z, φ) plane, displaying some example trajectories of Josephson oscillations and self-trapping dynamics, corresponding to a couple of oscillation periods. The numerical results are compared with the predictions of the analytic ATM model, shown as solid black lines. The parameters of the two-mode model, the interaction energy U and the coupling energy K , are ex-




FIG. 2. Josephson oscillations and self-trapping behavior in the non-rotating triangular supersolid, as obtained from the ATM model (solid black line) and GP simulations (colored dots). The leftmost panels display the evolution of the population imbalance Z relative to the equilibrium value Z_e ; the central panel, the evolution of the phase difference between the central and ring droplets (see Fig. 1); and the rightmost panel, the phase diagram in the (Z, φ) plane, with an additional trajectory represented by gray triangles. The dashed line represents the separatrix between Josephson and self-trapping dynamics. The self-trapping case for $Z > Z_e$ (red filled circles) is achieved by gradually reducing the attractive *egg-box* potential over 10 ms to prevent generating significant excitations in the system.

tracted from the output of the GP simulations, as detailed in the Supplemental Material, yielding $K/\hbar \simeq 16$ Hz and $U/\hbar \simeq 0.016$ Hz. The comparison shows remarkable agreement.

In Fig. 3, we show a comparison between the *small* and *large* amplitude Josephson oscillations displayed in the phase-space diagram of Fig. 2, with the former corresponding to the inner trajectory (represented by purple diamonds) and the latter to the outer trajectory near the separatrix (represented by gray triangles). Remarkably, despite its simplicity, the ATM model correctly predicts the character of Josephson oscillations beyond the small-




FIG. 3. Comparison between *small* amplitude (violet diamonds) and *large* amplitude (gray triangles) Josephson oscillations from GP simulations (see text). The solid lines show the ATM model predictions, with the same color code. The data of the GP simulation correspond to those displayed in the phase-space diagram of Fig. 2.

amplitude regime, where the behavior is no longer sinusoidal. This demonstrates the robustness of the model across a wide range of configurations and provides further evidence that the Josephson junction is the dominant mechanism driving the dynamical evolution.

Rotating system. We now turn to consider the case of a supersolid under rotation along the z -axis. To this end, we start from a non-rotating supersolid and apply a torque using the *egg-box* potential, gradually increasing its angular velocity Ω (see Supplemental Material for details). As the system's rotation increases, the equilibrium position Z_e shifts, and the distance between the droplets in the ring relative to the origin also changes. These effects arise from a modification of the effective trapping frequency, $\tilde{\omega} = \sqrt{\omega_r^2 - \Omega^2}$, caused by the centrifugal force, as discussed further in the Supplemental Material. The *egg-box* potential can be tuned so that, when it is switched off, the relative imbalance $Z - Z_e(\Omega)$ reaches the desired value. After the potential is removed, the supersolid remains self-sustaining, and the droplet positions and their relative populations oscillate, leading to variations in the moment of inertia. As a result, the rotation speed adjusts accordingly, with an amplitude variation below 10% in the studied cases, due to angular momentum conservation.

Nevertheless, despite these complications and the fact that vortices enter the system, typically sitting at the junctions between the droplets [39, 40, 42, 47], the system continues to display the full range of dynamics behaviors, similar to the non-rotating case. These include Josephson oscillations and self-trapping dynamics, observed for both $Z < Z_e$ and $Z > Z_e$, as illustrated in Fig. 4 for




FIG. 4. Phase-space portrait for dynamical simulations (top), evolution of the imbalance Z (center), and evolution of the phase φ (bottom), for a rotating supersolid with $\Omega = 2\pi \times 20$ Hz. Each data point style refers to an evolution with different initial imbalance. In all cases the rotation has been implemented with a 100 ms linear ramp (from 0 to Ω) followed by 10 ms relaxation of the *egg-box* potential and 90 ms of free evolution, (encompassing various periods of the oscillation for all scenarios). Black lines represent theoretical predictions based on the ATM model, similar to Fig. 2 (see there for a full description).

a representative case with $\Omega = 2\pi \times 20$ Hz ($Z_e = 0.59$). Similarly to the non-rotating case shown in Fig. 2, this figure presents typical trajectories of Josephson oscillations and self-trapping dynamics in the phase-space representation (top panel), along with the corresponding behavior of the imbalance and phase over time (middle and lower panels, respectively). Remarkably, even in this case, the two-mode model provides an accurate reference framework, with $K/\hbar \simeq 10$ Hz and $U/\hbar \simeq 0.018$ Hz (see Supplemental Material). Indeed, the model predictions (black lines) accurately reproduce the dynamical behavior of the junction after the preparation stage (the ramp) has been completed, as shown in the two lower panels, and thus also the corresponding trajectories in the (Z, φ) plane in the top panel.

Conclusions. We have demonstrated that a dipolar supersolid can exhibit both Josephson oscillations and self-trapping behavior, depending on the initial population imbalance between the central and ring droplets. For this

we have considered a triangular supersolid lattice with a central droplet surrounded by six external droplets arranged in a ring. The main features of this system can be accurately reproduced by an asymmetric two-mode model, which depends on only two parameters, K and U , corresponding to the hopping between droplets and the interaction energies per particle, respectively. We have investigated both the static configuration and the situation in which the supersolid is set into rotation at constant angular velocity Ω , finding that the system's ability to display the full range of dynamics behaviors across the junctions, as well as the model description, remain robust even under rotation. In addition, the ability to adjust the angular velocity offers an interesting tool for tuning the strength of the weak link between the droplets forming the supersolid. These results provide a proof-of-concept that this geometry offers a feasible and versatile experimental setup capable of sustaining a full spectrum of junction dynamics in supersolids, notably including self-trapping in addition to the recently observed Josephson oscillations [25], paving the way for future studies on their dynamics and stability under various conditions.

Acknowledgments. We acknowledge fruitful discussions with H. M. Cataldo. This work was supported by Grant PID2021-126273NB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF A way of making Europe”, by the Basque Government through Grant No. IT1470-22, and by the European Research Council through the Advanced Grant “Supersolids” (No. 101055319). P.C. acknowledges support from CONICET and Universidad de Buenos Aires, through grants PIP 11220210100821CO and UBACyT 20020220100069BA, respectively.

-
- [1] B. Josephson, Possible new effects in superconductive tunnelling, *Phys. Lett.* **1**, 251 (1962).
 - [2] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, *Bose-Einstein condensation and superfluidity*, International Series of Monographs on Physics, Vol. 164 (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2016).
 - [3] A. Smerzi, S. Fantoni, S. Giovanazzi, and S. R. Shenoy, Quantum coherent atomic tunneling between two trapped Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4950 (1997).
 - [4] I. Zapata, F. Sols, and A. J. Leggett, Josephson effect between trapped Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, R28 (1998).
 - [5] S. Raghavan, A. Smerzi, S. Fantoni, and S. R. Shenoy, Coherent oscillations between two weakly coupled Bose-Einstein condensates: Josephson effects, π oscillations, and macroscopic quantum self-trapping, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 620 (1999).
 - [6] S. Giovanazzi, A. Smerzi, and S. Fantoni, Josephson effects in dilute Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4521 (2000).
 - [7] F. S. Cataliotti, S. Burger, C. Fort, P. Maddaloni, F. Mi-

- wardi, A. Trombettoni, A. Smerzi, and M. Inguscio, Josephson junction arrays with Bose-Einstein condensates, *Science* **293**, 843 (2001).
- [8] M. Albiez, R. Gati, J. Fölling, S. Hunsmann, M. Cristiani, and M. K. Oberthaler, Direct observation of tunneling and nonlinear self-trapping in a single bosonic Josephson junction, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010402 (2005).
- [9] D. Ananikian and T. Bergeman, Gross-Pitaevskii equation for Bose particles in a double-well potential: Two-mode models and beyond, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 013604 (2006).
- [10] S. Levy, E. Lahoud, I. Shomroni, and J. Steinhauer, The a.c. and d.c. Josephson effects in a Bose-Einstein condensate, *Nature* **449**, 579 (2007).
- [11] D. M. Jezek, P. Capuzzi, and H. M. Cataldo, Two-mode effective interaction in a double-well condensate, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 053625 (2013).
- [12] S. Martínez-Garaot, G. Pettini, and M. Modugno, Nonlinear mixing of Bogoliubov modes in a bosonic Josephson junction, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 043624 (2018).
- [13] M. Abad, M. Guilleumas, R. Mayol, M. Pi, and D. M. Jezek, A dipolar self-induced bosonic Josephson junction, *EPL* **94**, 10004 (2011).
- [14] M. Abad, M. Guilleumas, R. Mayol, M. Pi, and D. M. Jezek, Phase slippage and self-trapping in a self-induced bosonic Josephson junction, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 035601 (2011).
- [15] L. Tanzi, E. Lucioni, F. Famà, J. Catani, A. Fioretti, C. Gabbanini, R. N. Bisset, L. Santos, and G. Modugno, Observation of a dipolar quantum gas with metastable supersolid properties, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 130405 (2019).
- [16] F. Böttcher, J.-N. Schmidt, M. Wenzel, J. Hertkorn, M. Guo, T. Langen, and T. Pfau, Transient supersolid properties in an array of dipolar quantum droplets, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 011051 (2019).
- [17] L. Chomaz, D. Petter, P. Ilzhöfer, G. Natale, A. Trautmann, C. Politi, G. Durastante, R. M. W. van Bijnen, A. Patscheider, M. Sohmen, M. J. Mark, and F. Ferlaino, Long-lived and transient supersolid behaviors in dipolar quantum gases, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 021012 (2019).
- [18] M. Boninsegni and N. V. Prokofev, Colloquium: Supersolids: What and where are they?, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 759 (2012).
- [19] L. Chomaz, R. M. W. van Bijnen, D. Petter, G. Faraoni, S. Baier, J. H. Becher, M. J. Mark, F. Wächtler, L. Santos, and F. Ferlaino, Observation of roton mode population in a dipolar quantum gas, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 442 (2018).
- [20] G. Natale, R. M. W. van Bijnen, A. Patscheider, D. Petter, M. J. Mark, L. Chomaz, and F. Ferlaino, Excitation spectrum of a trapped dipolar supersolid and its experimental evidence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 050402 (2019).
- [21] L. Tanzi, J. G. Maloberti, G. Biagioni, A. Fioretti, C. Gabbanini, and G. Modugno, Evidence of superfluidity in a dipolar supersolid from nonclassical rotational inertia, *Science* **371**, 1162 (2021).
- [22] M. A. Norcia, C. Politi, L. Klaus, E. Poli, M. Sohmen, M. J. Mark, R. N. Bisset, L. Santos, and F. Ferlaino, Two-dimensional supersolidity in a dipolar quantum gas, *Nature* **596**, 357 (2021).
- [23] M. Sohmen, C. Politi, L. Klaus, L. Chomaz, M. J. Mark, M. A. Norcia, and F. Ferlaino, Birth, life, and death of a dipolar supersolid, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 233401 (2021).
- [24] T. Bland, E. Poli, C. Politi, L. Klaus, M. A. Norcia, F. Ferlaino, L. Santos, and R. N. Bisset, Two-dimensional supersolid formation in dipolar condensates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 195302 (2022).
- [25] G. Biagioni, N. Antolini, B. Donelli, L. Pezzè, A. Smerzi, M. Fattori, A. Fioretti, C. Gabbanini, M. Inguscio, L. Tanzi, and G. Modugno, Measurement of the superfluid fraction of a supersolid by Josephson effect, *Nature* **629**, 773 (2024).
- [26] P. Ilzhöfer, M. Sohmen, G. Durastante, C. Politi, A. Trautmann, G. Natale, G. Morpurgo, T. Giamarchi, L. Chomaz, M. J. Mark, and F. Ferlaino, Phase coherence in out-of-equilibrium supersolid states of ultracold dipolar atoms, *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 356 (2021).
- [27] B. Juliá-Díaz, J. Martorell, M. Melé-Messeguer, and A. Polls, Beyond standard two-mode dynamics in bosonic Josephson junctions, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 063626 (2010).
- [28] A. Burchianti, C. Fort, and M. Modugno, Josephson plasma oscillations and the Gross-Pitaevskii equation: Bogoliubov approach versus two-mode model, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 023627 (2017).
- [29] M. Nigro, P. Capuzzi, H. M. Cataldo, and D. M. Jezek, Effective two-mode model in Bose-Einstein condensates versus Gross-Pitaevskii simulations, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **71**, 297 (2017).
- [30] H. M. Cataldo and D. M. Jezek, Dynamics in asymmetric double-well condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 043610 (2014).
- [31] C. Ryu, P. W. Blackburn, A. A. Blinova, and M. G. Boshier, Experimental Realization of Josephson Junctions for an Atom SQUID, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 205301 (2013).
- [32] Y. Castin and R. Dum, Bose-Einstein condensates with vortices in rotating traps, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **7**, 399 (1999).
- [33] M. Modugno, L. Pricoupenko, and Y. Castin, Bose-Einstein condensates with a bent vortex in rotating traps, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **22**, 235 (2003).
- [34] C. J. Foster, P. B. Blakie, and M. J. Davis, Vortex pairing in two-dimensional Bose gases, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 023623 (2010).
- [35] A. Kato, Y. Nakano, K. Kasamatsu, and T. Matsui, Vortex formation of a Bose-Einstein condensate in a rotating deep optical lattice, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 053623 (2011).
- [36] A. Gallemí, S. M. Rocuzzo, S. Stringari, and A. Recati, Quantized vortices in dipolar supersolid Bose-Einstein condensed gases, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 023322 (2020).
- [37] F. Ancilotto, M. Barranco, M. Pi, and L. Reatto, Vortices in the supersolid phase of dipolar Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 033314 (2021).
- [38] D. M. Jezek and P. Capuzzi, Vortex nucleation processes in rotating lattices of Bose-Einstein condensates ruled by the on-site phases, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, 023310 (2023).
- [39] E. Poli, T. Bland, S. J. M. White, M. J. Mark, F. Ferlaino, S. Trabucco, and M. Mannarelli, Glitches in rotating supersolids, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 223401 (2023).
- [40] A. Alaña, M. Modugno, P. Capuzzi, and D. M. Jezek, Phase-induced vortex pinning in rotating supersolid dipolar systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **110**, 023306 (2024).
- [41] R. A. Williams, S. Al-Assam, and C. J. Foot, Observation of vortex nucleation in a rotating two-dimensional lattice of Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 050404 (2010).
- [42] E. Casotti, E. Poli, L. Klaus, A. Litvinov, C. Ulm, C. Politi, M. J. Mark, T. Bland, and F. Ferlaino, Observation of vortices in a dipolar supersolid (2024), [arXiv:2403.18510](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.18510) [cond-mat.quant-gas].

- [43] M. Nigro, P. Capuzzi, and D. M. Jezek, Bose–Einstein condensates in rotating ring-shaped lattices: a multi-mode model, *J. Phys. B* **53**, 025301 (2020).
- [44] S. M. Roccuzzo, A. Gallemí, A. Recati, and S. Stringari, Rotating a supersolid dipolar gas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 045702 (2020).
- [45] S. M. Roccuzzo, A. Recati, and S. Stringari, Moment of inertia and dynamical rotational response of a supersolid dipolar gas, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 023316 (2022).
- [46] A. Alaña, N. Antolini, G. Biagioni, I. L. Egusquiza, and M. Modugno, Crossing the superfluid-supersolid transition of an elongated dipolar condensate, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 043313 (2022).
- [47] T. Bland, F. Ferlaino, M. Mannarelli, E. Poli, and S. Trabucco, Exploring Pulsar Glitches with Dipolar Supersolids, *Few-Body Systems* **65**, 81 (2024), 2407.03212.

Supplemental Material for “Self-sustained Josephson dynamics and self-trapping in supersolids”

Aitor Alaña,^{1,2} Michele Modugno,^{1,3,2} Pablo Capuzzi,^{4,5} and D. M. Jezek⁵

¹*Department of Physics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, 48080 Bilbao, Spain*

²*EHU Quantum Center, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, 48940 Leioa, Biscay, Spain*

³*IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, 48009 Bilbao, Spain*

⁴*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Departamento de Física, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina*

⁵*CONICET - Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Física de Buenos Aires (IFIBA), 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina*

(Dated: January 16, 2025)

GROSS-PITAEVSKII SIMULATIONS

We describe the system using the usual extended Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) theory, which includes the dipole-dipole interaction term [1] and quantum fluctuations in the form of the Lee-Huang-Yang (LHY) correction, within the local density approximation [2–5]. The corresponding energy functional can be written as $E[\psi, \psi^*] \equiv E_{\text{GP}} + E_{\text{dd}} + E_{\text{LHY}}$, with

$$E_{\text{GP}} = \int \left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} |\nabla\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2 + V(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{g}{2}n^2(\mathbf{r}) \right] d\mathbf{r},$$

$$E_{\text{dd}} = \frac{C_{\text{dd}}}{2} \iint n(\mathbf{r})V_{\text{dd}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')n(\mathbf{r}')d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}', \quad (1)$$

$$E_{\text{LHY}} = \frac{2}{5}\gamma_{\text{LHY}} \int n^{5/2}(\mathbf{r})d\mathbf{r}.$$

The term $E_{\text{GP}} = E_{\text{k}} + E_{\text{ho}} + E_{\text{int}}$ includes the kinetic, potential, and contact interaction energies, where $V(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the external potential, $n(\mathbf{r}) = |\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2$ the condensate density (normalized to the total number of particles N), and $g = 4\pi\hbar^2 a_s/m$ the contact interaction strength. The term E_{dd} represents the energy associated with the dipole-dipole interaction, defined through the potential $V_{\text{dd}}(\mathbf{r}) = (1 - 3\cos^2\theta)/(4\pi r^3)$, where $C_{\text{dd}} \equiv \mu_0\mu^2$ is the strength, μ is the modulus of the dipole moment $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, and θ is the angle between the dipole axis and the vector \mathbf{r} representing the distance between the dipoles, with $\cos\theta = \boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \mathbf{r}/(\mu r)$. The LHY energy E_{LHY} is fixed by the coefficient $\gamma_{\text{LHY}} = 128\sqrt{\pi}\hbar^2 a_s^{5/2}/(3m)(1 + \epsilon_{\text{dd}}^2/2)$, with $\epsilon_{\text{dd}} = \mu_0\mu^2 N/(3g)$.

We employ numerical simulations both for computing the ground state and the dynamical evolution. The time-dependent generalized GP equation is obtained as [6]

$$i\hbar\partial_t\psi = \delta E[\psi, \psi^*]/\delta\psi^*, \quad (2)$$

where the energy functional $E[\psi, \psi^*]$ is the one defined above, see Eq. (1). For the ground state, we use the minimization of the energy functional with the conjugate gradient method (see, e.g., Refs. [7, 8]). For the dynamical evolution, we employ a FFT split-step algorithm [9]. The computations are performed on a box of $24\mu\text{m} \times 24\mu\text{m} \times 24\mu\text{m}$, with a grid of $192 \times 192 \times 64$ points.

Preparation of the non-equilibrium states

To create a population imbalance in the system and/or set the system in rotation, we introduce an additional external potential consisting of a set of Gaussian wells arranged with the same hexagonal symmetry as the ring of droplets, which we denote as the *egg-box* potential. It can be written as follows,

$$V_{\text{egg}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}, t) = V_0(t)e^{-2\rho^2/\sigma_0^2} + V_r(t)\sum_{i=1}^6 e^{-2|\boldsymbol{\rho} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{0i}(t)|^2/\sigma_0^2}, \quad (3)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ representing the radial coordinate in the (x, y) plane, $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{0i}$ the center-of-mass positions of the ring droplets, σ_0 the widths of the Gaussians, and V_0 and V_r the strengths of the central and the ring wells, respectively. Typical values that we employ are $\sigma_0 = 1.5\mu\text{m}$, $V_r/h \simeq 625$ Hz, and V_0/V_r varied in the range $[0.5, 1.5]$. This potential provides an attractive force to control the position and population of the droplets. By tuning the relative strength of the central and ring wells, one can adjust the initial imbalance of Z , either above or below the equilibrium value Z_e . Dynamically changing the values of $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{0i}(t)$ corresponds to imprinting a torque onto the system, making it rotate. Specifically, we consider rotations at variable angular velocity $\Omega(t)$, which can be obtained by setting $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{0i}(t) = \hat{R}[\theta(t)]\boldsymbol{\rho}_{0i}(0)$, where $\dot{\theta}(t) = \Omega(t)$ and \hat{R} is the rotation operator. Notably, the potential in Eq. (3) also provides a trapping force, preventing the outward drift of the droplets.

Non-rotating system. In this case, we use a static potential $V_{\text{egg}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. For a population fraction of the central droplet larger (smaller) than the equilibrium value, with $Z < Z_e$ ($Z > Z_e$), we turn on V_0 (V_r), while keeping the other potential set to zero. Such a potential can be tuned to achieve the desired initial value of the imbalance, $Z(0)$. The potential is then switched off, and the system is allowed to evolve freely in the harmonic trap.

Rotating system. Here, we use a fully time-dependent potential, $V_{\text{egg}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}, t)$. The initial imbalance at $t = 0$ is set in the same way as in the previous non-rotating case. The lattice structure is then rotated rigidly by periodically driving the positions $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{0i}(t)$, as described earlier, by increasing the rotation frequency from 0 to $\Omega(t_f)$ via a




FIG. 1. Equilibrium imbalance, total populations of the droplets (relative to the maximum population), and the mean radius of the ring at the equilibrium states as functions of Ω . Solid lines correspond to the non-rotating system with $\tilde{\omega} = \sqrt{\omega_r^2 - \Omega^2}$, and red dots are obtained from actual ground state simulations in the rotating scenario.

linear ramp over a time $t_f = 100$ ms. At the end of this stage, the *egg-box* potential is linearly ramped down to zero over 10 ms, by changing the values of both $V_r(t)$ and $V_0(t)$. It is also worth noting that, when the system is rotating, the equilibrium configuration changes, affecting both the equilibrium position Z_e and the positions of the ring droplets. This can be attributed to the centrifugal force, which effectively weakens the radial trapping potential, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Owing to this, for a given rotation frequency, we also adjust the radius $|\rho_{0i}(0)|$ of the ring droplets to set the desired initial conditions for the two-mode model in each simulation.

PARAMETERS OF THE ATM MODEL

The parameters of the two-mode model, namely the interaction energy U and coupling energy K , can be extracted from the output of the GP simulations as follows.

In the *non-rotating* case, the parameter U can be determined from the ST dynamics in the bottom panels in Fig. 2 of the main article (blue empty circles) while disregarding the second term in Eq. (2) of the main text, assuming $K \ll NU$. This leads to

$$U/\hbar \simeq \frac{2\pi}{TN|\bar{Z} - Z_e|}, \quad (4)$$

where \bar{Z} is the mean value in an oscillation and T is its period. From the simulation, we have $T \simeq 25$ ms, $\bar{Z} \simeq 0.45$, yielding $U/\hbar \simeq 0.016$ Hz (recalling that $N = 1.1 \times 10^5$).

The coupling energy K can be instead obtained from the Josephson oscillation. Indeed, in the small amplitude

regime, the oscillation period T_J can be written as

$$T_J \simeq \frac{2\pi\hbar}{\sqrt{KUN\sqrt{1-Z_e^2}}}, \quad (5)$$

so that

$$K/\hbar \simeq \left[\frac{2\pi}{T_J}\right]^2 \frac{1}{UN\sqrt{1-Z_e^2}}. \quad (6)$$

From the Josephson oscillations in the central panels of Fig. 2 of the main article (magenta diamonds), one obtains $T_J \simeq 41.1$ ms. Using the above equation, we can then estimate $K/\hbar \simeq 16$ Hz. The above results also allow us to check the validity of the assumption $K \ll NU$, which in the present case reads $16 \ll 1.76 \times 10^3$. This confirms the consistency of the approach.

In the *rotating case*, the same approach can be used, this time determining the parameters U and K from the simulations shown in Fig. 4 of the main article. Specifically, U is derived from the self-trapping oscillation with $\bar{Z} - Z_e \sim 0.2$ (red squares in the figure), yielding $U/\hbar \simeq 0.018$ Hz. The value of K can instead be extracted from the period of the small amplitude Josephson oscillations, by discarding a transient initial stage in which there are noisy oscillations produced by the ramp. From this, we estimate $T_J \simeq 49$ ms, yielding $K/\hbar \simeq 10$ Hz.

-
- [1] S. Ronen, D. C. E. Bortolotti, and J. L. Bohn, Bogoliubov modes of a dipolar condensate in a cylindrical trap, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 013623 (2006).
 - [2] U. R. Fisher, Stability of quasi-two-dimensional Bose-Einstein condensates with dominant dipole-dipole interactions, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 031602 (2006).
 - [3] A. R. P. Lima and A. Pelster, Beyond mean-field low-lying excitations of dipolar Bose gases, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 063609 (2012).
 - [4] F. Wächtler and L. Santos, Ground-state properties and elementary excitations of quantum droplets in dipolar Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 043618 (2016).
 - [5] M. Schmitt, M. Wenzel, F. Böttcher, I. Ferrier-Barbut, and T. Pfau, Self-bound droplets of a dilute magnetic quantum liquid, *Nature (London)* **539**, 259 (2016).
 - [6] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, *Bose-Einstein condensation and superfluidity*, International Series of Monographs on Physics, Vol. 164 (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2016).
 - [7] M. Modugno, L. Pricoupenko, and Y. Castin, Bose-Einstein condensates with a bent vortex in rotating traps, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **22**, 235 (2003).
 - [8] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes: The Art of Scientific Computing*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge University Press, USA, 2007).
 - [9] B. Jackson, J. F. McCann, and C. S. Adams, Output coupling and flow of a dilute Bose-Einstein condensate, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **31**, 4489 (1998).