

# On quantum phase transition in a gas of ultra cold atoms

Jakub Zakrzewski

*Instytut Fizyki im. Mariana Smoluchowskiego and Mark Kac Complex Systems Research Center,  
Uniwersytet Jagielloński, ulica Reymonta 4, PL-30-059 Kraków, Poland*

(Dated: 23rd May 2019)

A large scale dynamical simulation of the superfluid to Mott insulator transition in the gas of ultra cold atoms placed in an optical lattice is performed using the time dependent Gutzwiller mean field approach. This approximate treatment allows us to take into account most of the details of the recent experiment [Nature **415**, 39 (2002)] where by changing the depth of the lattice potential an adiabatic transition from a superfluid to a Mott insulator state has been reported. Our simulations reveal a significant excitation of the system with a transition to insulator in restricted regions of the trap.

A theoretical suggestion [1] of a possibility to realize one of the standard models for interacting particles - the Bose-Hubbard model [2, 3] in a cold gas placed in an optical lattice has been followed soon by a seminal experiment [4]. The reported realization of a quantum phase transition between superfluid (SF) and Mott insulator (MI) phases showed convincingly that it was possible to control experimentally parameters of the model practically at will. This triggered several studies involving Bose condensate [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10] as well as, more recently Fermi-Bose mixtures [11, 12, 13] placed on the optical lattices (the reference list must be not complete bearing in mind that more than 70 papers with “optical lattice” in the title are listed in the cond-mat archive last year only).

At the same time a number of groups [14, 15, 16, 17, 18] tried to understand the details of the very first experiment [4] to check the underlying physics. To imagine the difficulty in modeling the experiment let us recall that it involves about  $10^5$  interacting atoms (bosons) placed in the harmonic trap and the three dimensional (3D) lattice potential. Such a system is well described by a Bose-Hubbard model with position dependent chemical potential [1]. Even finding the ground state of the system for that number of particles and  $65 \times 65 \times 65$  lattice sites is a formidable task. State of the art quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) [14, 15, 17] calculations aimed at the ground state properties include up to 16 sites in 3D [14], more sites may be included in one dimensional (1D) models [15, 17]. These studies, while interesting on their own, can shed little light on the *dynamics* of the system when its parameters are varied. Except for special exactly solvable models, the efficient simulation of time-dependent properties of interacting many-body system remains an open problem although recently quite a progress has been obtained for 1D systems [20, 21].

It seems, therefore, that the only reasonable and tractable way of analysing the dynamics of the discussed experiment is using approximate methods. To this end we shall use an approach based on the time dependent variational principle with Gutzwiller ansatz [19]. One

minimizes then

$$\langle G(t) | i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - H(t) - \mu \hat{N} | G(t) \rangle, \quad (1)$$

with  $H(t)$  being the Hamiltonian,  $\hat{N}$  the number of particles operator,  $\mu$  the chemical potential (being itself time dependent when system parameters are varied) and  $|G(t)\rangle$  the trial wavefunction. The latter, (as in the more popular time independent situation) is assumed in the standard Gutzwiller-type form

$$|G(t)\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^M \left( \sum_{n=0}^{n_m} f_n^{(i)}(t) |n\rangle_i \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $M$  is the number of sites, while  $n_m$  is a maximal occupation included in the calculation. The very same approach has been successfully applied recently to the formation of molecules [8, 9], the treatment of the disordered optical lattices [10] as well as for determining the phase diagram in Bose-Fermi mixtures [13].

The Bose-Hubbard Hamiltonian describing the system takes the form [1]

$$H = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J a_i^\dagger a_j + \frac{U}{2} \sum_i n_i(n_i - 1) + \sum_i W_i n_i. \quad (3)$$

where  $n_i = a_i^\dagger a_i$  is an occupation number operator at site  $i$  (with  $a_i$  being the corresponding annihilation bosonic operator),  $U$  the interaction energy,  $J$  the tunneling coefficient and  $W_i$  the energy offset at site  $i$ . Both  $J$  and  $U$  are functions of the lattice potential and may be easily expressed in terms of integrals of the Wannier functions of the lowest energy band [1]. The change in time of the lattice potential depth  $V(t)$  leads then to an appropriate time dependence of  $U$  and  $J$ . The energy offset at each site  $W_i$  has two components in the experiment [4]. One is the harmonic magnetic trap potential (time-independent), another is due to the gaussian intensity profiles of lattice creating laser beams. The latter may be also approximated by a harmonic term [4] the corresponding frequency becomes time dependent when the depth  $V$  is changed. All these effects have to be included in the realistic simulation of the experiment.

The experiment was performed in three stages [4] after loading the harmonic trap with Rb condensate. Firstly, the optical lattice depth  $V(t)$  was increased in 80 ms (using exponential ramp with time constant of 20 ms) from the initial zero value (when the harmonic trap was present only) to  $V_{max} = 22E_r$ , where  $E_r$  is the recoil energy of Rb atoms. The sample was then held for 20ms at  $V_{max}$ . Finally  $V(t)$  was decreased with the linear ramp to  $V_f = 9E_r$  with different speed. At any stage the experiment could be interrupted by rapidly swithing off all laser beams building up the lattice as well as the magnetic trap. The freely expanding atomic cloud, after some delay, was recorded by a destructive absorption imaging, yielding the signal which reflects the momentum distribution [14, 16]. For clouds released from low optical lattices when tunneling dominates and the superfluid behaviour is expected the signal reflects Bragg peaks due to interferences of atoms coming from different lattice sites. At increased lattice depths above  $13E_r$  the interference maxima become immersed in an incoherent background disappearing practically at  $20E_r$ . This behaviour was associated with the quantum phase transition from SF to MI phase [4]. Most interestingly the coherence of the sample may be rapidly recovered when the lattice depth is decreased (third stage of the experiment) (as measured by the width of the central interference peak which decreases almost to its original vlaue at  $V = 9E_r$  in about 4ms.

It is most interesting to see whether (and to what extend) the aproximate mean field dynamical approach can reproduce experimental findings. For positive answer, one can further hope to learn more about the system from different simulation data available.

We try to reproduce as closely as possible the experimental details [4]. We treat a 3D lattice  $65 \times 65 \times 65$  sites placed in the harmonic trap (including both the magnetic trap component as well as the contribution of laser intensity profiles). The parameters of the Bose-Hubbard Hamiltonian are calculated for different  $V$  values using appropriate Wannier functions for the problem. In effect the only free parameter is the number of atoms in the condensate. This number is exactly preserved by the mean field time evolution governed by (1) [8].

To integrate the set of coupled differential equations for  $f_n^{(i)}(t)$  resulting from (1) with Gutzwiller ansatz (2) one needs the initial vector of  $f_n^{(i)}(0)$ . It is determined, self consistently, by the standard Gutzwiller time independent variational principle. Using the same ansatz (2) one minimizes then

$$\langle G | H - \mu \hat{N} | G \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where  $\hat{N} = \sum_i n_i$  obtaining the mean field ground state of the system for a given  $\mu$ . As a test we compared the radial occupations of sites in the ground state for a smaller  $16 \times 16 \times 16$  lattice with results of the quantum

Monte Carlo calculations [14] (for the same parameters) - the corresponding distributions are in very good visual agreement. Fig.1 present the similar radial ground state distributions for the experimental parameters of [4] and  $\mu$ 's adjusted (for each case) to have the average number of atoms  $N = \langle \hat{N} \rangle = \sum_i \langle n_i \rangle$  around  $10^5$ . This leads to more than two atoms (on average) per site in the center of the trap. It is thus safe to take  $n_m = 7$  in (2). To characterize whether the state is closer to being superfluid or Mott insulator we find it convenient to define the superfluid factor  $\gamma_{SF} = 1/N \sum \langle a_i \rangle \langle a_i^\dagger \rangle$ . This factor is zero for pure MI state (when  $\langle a_i \rangle = 0$  as each node is in a Fock state) and reaches unity for Poissonian statistics at each node. Using this factor we can quantify states shown in Fig. 1, noting first a general qualitative agreement with experimental findings [4]. The case  $V = 9E_r$  seems almost fully superfluid (with, however, strongly subpoissonian statistics [22] at each site), the case  $V = 13E_r$  shows first traces of insulator phase (integer occupation of sites with vanishing variance, the transition is completed for significant fraction of sites at  $V = 16E_r$  while for the deepest lattice  $V = 22E_r$  SF fraction is restricted to very narrow regions separating different integer occupations. /bin/sh: regions: command not found

Having the mean field ground state we pass to the dynamical simulations. As mentioned above, the lattice depth  $V$  in the first stage of the experiment was increased using the exponential ramp with the time constant of 20ms over the time of 80 ms (reaching  $V = 22E_r$ ). According to [4] this ensures that the condensate always remains in the many-body ground state and thus the quantum phase transition [3] from SF (at low  $V$ ) to MI is realized. Our simulations reveal that to assure adiabaticity a small change of  $V$  on the superfluid side (say from  $V = 9E_r$  to  $V = 9.1E_r$ ) requires about 20ms (one needs 40 ms for a loop from  $V = 9E_r$  to  $V = 9.1E_r$  and back to keep the overlap on the initial state of the order of 99 percent). And yet the whole interesting region from  $V = 9E_r$  to  $V = 22E_r$  is passed in about 20ms in the experiment!

To test the adiabatic issue further we shall concentrate in the following on the most interesting regime containing the quantum phase transition above  $V = 9E_r$ . Starting from the Gutzwiller mean field ground state at  $V = 9E_r$  we simulate the time evolution up to  $V = 22E_r$  (with experimental profiles). We may compare the dynamically obtained wavefunction (see insert in Fig. 2) with the mean field ground state at  $V = 22E_r$  (bottom right panel in Fig 1). While the ground state has an insulator character almost everywhere in the trap with  $\gamma_{SF} = 0.01$ , the dynamically evolved wavefunction, by comparison, seems to reflect an excited wavepacket and it has rather small regions where occupation of sites is close to integer with vanishing number variance only. The corresponding  $\gamma_{SF} = 0.12$  indicates, however, that MI character is dom-




Figure 1: On-site filling factors  $\langle n_i \rangle$  (solid line) and twice their variances  $2\sigma_i^2 = 2(\langle n_i^2 \rangle - \langle n_i \rangle^2)$  (dashed line) for different lattice depths as indicated in the panels as a function of the lattice site. The distance from the center of the trap is measured in lattice constants. The total number of atoms and the SF factor  $\gamma_{SF}$  (see text) for each plot are:  $V = 9E_r$ ,  $N = 99771$ ,  $\gamma_{SF} = 0.95$ ;  $V = 13E_r$ ,  $N = 99502$ ,  $\gamma_{SF} = 0.40$ ;  $V = 16E_r$ ,  $N = 95408$ ,  $\gamma_{SF} = 0.11$ ;  $V = 22E_r$ ,  $N = 94172$ ,  $\gamma_{SF} = 0.01$ .

inant, thus transition to insulator indeed happen (except that it seems to be not adiabatic and involving excited many body states).

In the experiment, after reaching  $V = 22E_r$  the lattice height is kept constant for 20ms and then rapidly decreased back to  $V = 9E_r$ . It is shown that the time of restoring the coherence is of the order of 4ms from the widths of the observed interference patterns. If, indeed no excitation occurred during the lattice height increase stage then at  $V = 22E_r$  the system would be in the corresponding ground state and the final stage could be reproduced starting from this state. Our simulations fail to reproduce this fact. Depending on the slope of the final decrease the height of the pattern changes but not the half-width of the central peak (evaluated according to the recipe of Ref.3).

Maybe our mean field simulations are not sufficient to reproduce the experimental results? It is not so, as shown in Fig. 2. We make a simulation, starting from the static solution in the SF regime (taken for the convenience at  $V = 9$  again) increasing exponentially the lattice height as in the experiment [4], the subsequent delay of 20 ms at  $V = 22E_r$  and a linear ramp-down with various slopes. Note that the shape of the curve

as well as the time scale of restoring the coherence is in quite good agreement with the experiment. While the experimental data could be fit with a double exponential decay with two time scales, our mean field data are reasonably reproduced with a single exponential decay with time scale  $\tau = 1.45$  ms. This nicely corresponds with the shorter time scale of the experiment (0.94 ms). The obtained time scale is also of the order of a typical single tunneling time ( $1/J$  in appropriate units) to the nearby site. On the other hand, if we associate the second time scale with long range correlation between sites it becomes clear why this time scale does not manifest itself in our mean field simulations – the Gutzwiller wavefunction neglects entanglement between sites.

The observed quite good agreement with the experiment [4] seems to be a spectacular success of the dynamical mean field simulation bearing in mind its simplicity. Our results suggest that the system has quite a long memory and remembers that it was originally a SF. This fits nicely with the excited wavepacket-like character of dynamically obtained wavefunction – the inset of Fig. 2.

To summarize, it has been shown that the mean field Gutzwiller approximation allows one to simulate a dynamics of inhomogeneous Bose-Hubbard model taking




Figure 2: Half-width of the central interference peak for different ramp down times  $t_r$ . It is obtained fitting the lorentzian to the profile obtained from the Fourier transform of the single-particle density matrix [14]. Filled circles are connected by a line to guide the eye. Dashed line is a single exponential decay with a time constant  $\tau = 1.45$  ms. The inset shows the radial occupancy of different lattice sites for dynamically evolved wavefunction at  $V = 22E_r$  (after the first stage) as well as twice its variance  $2\sigma_i^2$  (dashed) to be compared with the Gutzwiller ground state presented in Fig. 1, bottom right panel.

into account realistic experimental conditions. The accuracy of the approximation cannot be controlled which is the major drawback of the present approach (a comparison with exact dynamics for small systems will lead us nowhere since then the mean field approach is known to fail). On the other hand a comparison with the available data seems quite encouraging. Accepting mean field predictions we may confirm that indeed the transition from superfluid to Mott insulator takes place in the experiment [4]. On the other hand the claim that the first stage of the experiment is performed adiabatically assuring that the system remains in its many body ground state (and thus a genuine textbook quantum phase transition [3] is realised) seems questionable.

Lastly, let us mention, that a very recent preprint [23] reports a study of exact dynamics of the model using the method of [20, 21]. However, the results consider at most 49 atoms in 40 sites of 1D lattice.

Participation of D. Delande at the early stage of

this work is appreciated as well as discussions with M. Lewenstein and K. Sacha. This work was supported by Polish Committee for Scientific Research Grant Quantum Information and Quantum Engineering, PBZ-MIN-008/P03/2003.

- 
- [1] D. Jaksch, C. Bruder, J. I. Cirac, C.W. Gardiner, & P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3108 (1998).
  - [2] M.P.A. Fisher, P.B. Weichman, G. Grinstein, & D.S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 546 (1989).
  - [3] S. Sachdev *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 2001).
  - [4] M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. Esslinger, T.W. Hänsch, & I. Bloch, Nature **415**, 39 (2002).
  - [5] D. van Oosten, P. van der Straten, and H.T.C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 053601 (2001).
  - [6] D.B.M. Dickerscheid, D. van Oosten, P.J.H. Denteneer, and H. T. C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 043623 (2003).
  - [7] C. Menotti, A. Smerzi, and A. Trombettoni, New J. Phys. **5**, 112 (2003).
  - [8] D. Jaksch, V. Venturi, J.I. Cirac, C.J. Williams, & P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 040402 (2002).
  - [9] B. Damski *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 110401 (2003).
  - [10] B. Damski, J. Zakrzewski, L. Santos, P. Zoller, & M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 080403 (2003).
  - [11] A. Albus, F. Illuminati, and J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 023606 (2003).
  - [12] H.P. Büchler and G. Blatter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 130404 (2003).
  - [13] Fehrmann, H., Baranov, M.A, Damski, B., Lewenstein, M., & Santos, L. cond-mat/0307635 (2003).
  - [14] Kashurnikov V.A., Prokof'ev N.V., & Svistunov B.V., Phys. Rev. A **66**, 031601 (2002).
  - [15] G.G. Batrouni *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 117203 (2002).
  - [16] W. Zwerger, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **5**, S9 (2003).
  - [17] S. Wessel, F. Alet, M. Troyer, and G.G. Batrouni, cond-mat 0404552.
  - [18] D.C. Roberts and K. Burnett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 150401 (2003).
  - [19] L. Amico and V. Penna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2189 (1998).
  - [20] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 147902 (2003).
  - [21] A.J. Daley, C. Kollath, U. Schollwöck, and G. Vidal, J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp. P04005 (2004).
  - [22] C. Orzel, A.K. Tuchman, M.L. Fenselau, M. Yasuda, and M.A. Kasevich, Science **291**, 2386 (2001).
  - [23] S.R. Clark and D. Jaksch, cond-mat/0405580.