

Rayleigh functional for nonlinear systems

Valery S. Shchesnovich*

Departamento de Física - Universidade Federal de Alagoas, Maceió AL 57072-970, Brazil

Abstract

In the search for an analog of the Rayleigh quotient for nonlinear systems we introduce the Rayleigh functional. It is defined using the energy functional and the normalization properties of the variables of variation. The key property of the Rayleigh quotient is preserved in our generalization: the extremals of the Rayleigh functional coincide with the stationary solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equation. Moreover, the second variation of the Rayleigh functional defines the stability of the solution. This gives rise to a powerful numerical optimization method in the search for the energy minimizers. It is shown that the popular imaginary time relaxation is just a special case of this optimization method. The Rayleigh functional can be used also in the analytical approach. For instance, we relate the scale invariance of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation and the well-known identity for the Townes soliton.

AMS subject classifications: 65K10, 35Q55, 82D05, 78M50

Keywords: Nonlinear Schrödinger equations, stationary solutions, numerical optimization

*Electronic address: valery@loqnl.ufal.br

I. INTRODUCTION

In dealing with the systems of equations having a large number of degrees of freedom (i.e., when there are many dependent variables) it is frequently necessary to adopt an approximation which leads to a nonlinear partial differential equation. For instance, the mean-field approach in the statistical physics is based on the introduction of the order parameter governed by a nonlinear equation. As an example, the mean-field theory of the Bose-Einstein condensate of a degenerate quantum gas is based on the Gross-Pitaevskii equation [1]. The Gross-Pitaevskii equation is the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with an external potential. It describes the so-called “matter waves” – the nonlinear collective modes of the degenerate quantum gas below the condensation temperature. In many other cases the approximate nonlinear equations, appearing as the leading order description of nonlinear waves in various branches of modern physics, for instance, in nonlinear optics, plasma, and on water, are of the nonlinear Schrödinger class (see, for instance, Ref. [2] and the references therein). In physics one is especially interested in the stationary solutions (a.k.a. the stationary points) of the governing equations, in particular, in the stationary points which minimize the energy. Only in some exceptional cases the solution can be obtained analytically and one has to rely on the numerical simulations. If the nonlinear equation in question possesses the Lagrangian formulation then the stationary points can be found by a nonlinear minimization (i.e. optimization) method.

The subject of the present paper is to propose a new optimization method for the nonlinear partial differential equations, in particular, for the equations of the nonlinear Schrödinger type. The proposed method consists of numerical minimization of the Rayleigh functional introduced in this paper. The potential of our method is similar to that of the optimization method for linear systems based on the Rayleigh quotient.

We consider the problem of finding the stationary solutions of a nonlinear partial differential equation (or a system of such) which has a Lagrangian formulation. Specifically, we adopt the energy functional of the following form

$$E\{\psi, \psi^*\} = \int d^n \vec{x} \mathcal{E}(\vec{x}, \psi(\vec{x}, t), \psi^*(\vec{x}, t), \nabla\psi(\vec{x}, t), \nabla\psi^*(\vec{x}, t)) \quad (1)$$

and its generalizations to several dependent variables $\psi_k(\vec{x})$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, and the higher order derivatives $\nabla^p \psi$, $p = 1, \dots, s$. We will adopt the notations of statistical physics, an important area of applications. For instance, the dependent variable $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$ will be referred

to as the order parameter. The Gross-Pitaevskii functional for the order parameter of the condensate,

$$E = \int d^3\vec{x} \left\{ |\nabla\psi(\vec{x}, t)|^2 + V(\vec{x})|\psi(\vec{x}, t)|^2 + \frac{g}{2}|\psi(\vec{x}, t)|^4 \right\}, \quad (2)$$

belongs to the class specified by equation (1). Here $g = 4\pi\hbar^2 a_s/m$ is the interaction coefficient due to the s-wave scattering of the atoms and $V(\vec{x})$ is the external trap (created by a magnetic field or non-resonant laser beams). The order parameter is usually normalized, for instance, to the number of atoms in the case of the Bose-Einstein condensate: $N = \int d^3\vec{x} |\psi|^2$.

Let us briefly recall the basics of the nonlinear optimization. One is interested in the stationary state, given as $\psi(\vec{x}, t) = e^{-i\mu t}\Psi(\vec{x})$, where μ is the chemical potential. The Euler-Lagrange equation corresponding to the energy functional (1) reads

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \frac{\delta E}{\delta\psi^*} \equiv \frac{\partial\mathcal{E}}{\partial\psi^*} - \nabla\frac{\partial\mathcal{E}}{\partial\nabla\psi^*}. \quad (3)$$

The stationary state satisfies the equation $\mu\Psi = \delta E/\delta\Psi^*$. The idea of the imaginary time evolution method is based on the fact that the variational derivative of a functional is equivalent to the gradient of a function and thus gives the direction of the most rapid increase. By introduction of the “imaginary time” $\tau = it$ in equation (3) one forces the order parameter to evolve in the direction of most rapid decrease of the energy functional. The attractor of such evolution is, hopefully, a local minimum (in general, just a stationary point). As the imaginary time evolution does not conserve the l_2 -norm $\|\psi\|^2 \equiv \int d^n\vec{x} |\psi|^2$, one normalizes the order parameter ψ directly during the evolution. Hence, the simplest imaginary time evolution method can be formulated as follows. One allows the order parameter to evolve in the space of arbitrary functions but normalizes the solution after each step by the prescription $\psi \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\psi\|}\psi$. This is formally equivalent to the following equation

$$\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau} = -\frac{\delta E\{\phi, \phi^*\}}{\delta\phi^*} \Big|_{\phi=\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\psi\|}\psi}. \quad (4)$$

The method of Lagrange multipliers (or, generally, the penalty function method) consists of the direct numerical minimization of some functional which has the stationary solution as its extremal point. In this case the time evolution of equation (4) is substituted by a finite-step minimization scheme, such as the method of steepest descent or the conjugate gradient method, and an appropriate line-search algorithm (for the line-search algorithms

and more information on the methods of finite-step optimization consult, for instance, Refs. [3, 4]). The minimization functional is usually the energy functional plus a penalty function. The latter takes care of the normalization constraint imposed on the order parameter. For instance, the following two functionals can be used

$$F_1\{\psi, \psi^*\} = E\{\psi, \psi^*\} - \mu \int d^n \vec{x} |\psi|^2, \quad F_2\{\psi, \psi^*\} = E\{\psi, \psi^*\} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\lambda - \int d^n \vec{x} |\psi|^2 \right)^2, \quad (5)$$

where the variable of variation is arbitrary (has arbitrary l_2 -norm). Indeed, the first of these functionals evidently has the stationary solutions as its extremals, while the second has the variation $\delta E/\delta \psi^* - (||\psi||^2 - \lambda)\psi$. Setting $\mu = (\lambda - ||\psi||^2)$ we get the stationary point by equating the variation of F_2 to zero. The use of the functional F_2 in the search for the energy minimizers was advocated recently in Ref. [5]. The point is that the zero solution $\psi = 0$, being an extremal, frequently makes reaching other solutions difficult with the use of the functional F_1 , while the functional F_2 is free from such a flaw. The functionals given in equation (5) are examples of the simplest possible penalty functions, $-\mu||\psi||^2$ in the first case and $(\lambda - ||\psi||^2)^2/2$ in the second. More complicated penalty functions can be devised. The simplest numerical realization is given by the steepest descent method:

$$\psi_{k+1} = \psi_k - \beta_k \frac{\delta F\{\psi_k, \psi_k^*\}}{\delta \psi_k^*}, \quad (6)$$

where the parameter β_k is selected by an appropriate line-search algorithm.

The paper is organized as follows. In section II we introduce the Rayleigh functional for the energy given by equation (1) and discuss its properties as a variational functional. The generalization to several order parameters is considered also. In section III we present the examples of the nonlinear optimization based on the Rayleigh functional. As an application of the Rayleigh functional in the analytical approach, in section IV we give a simple derivation of a well-known identity for the stationary solutions of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Finally, in section V the advantage of the numerical optimization method based on the Rayleigh functional is discussed.

II. DEFINITION AND PROPERTIES OF THE RAYLEIGH FUNCTIONAL

Before formulation of our nonlinear optimization method, it would be instructive to recall how the stationary points of the linear systems can be obtained. Consider, for instance, the

textbook problem of finding the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H} = -\nabla^2 + V(\vec{x})$ for a quantum particle in a potential well (we use $\hbar = 1$ and $m = 1/2$). Such a problem is reformulated as an optimization problem by employing the well-known Rayleigh quotient (see, for instance, Ref. [6])

$$\mathcal{R}\{\psi, \psi^*\} = \frac{\int d^3\vec{x} \psi^*(\vec{x}) \hat{H} \psi(\vec{x})}{\int d^3\vec{x} |\psi(\vec{x})|^2} = \int d^3\vec{x} \frac{\psi^*(\vec{x})}{\|\psi\|} \hat{H} \frac{\psi(\vec{x})}{\|\psi\|}. \quad (7)$$

The eigenfunctions are the stationary points of the Rayleigh quotient. Indeed

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{R}}{\delta \psi^*} = \frac{1}{\|\psi\|^2} \left(\hat{H} \psi - \varepsilon \psi \right) = 0, \quad (8)$$

where the eigenvalue is given as $\varepsilon = \mathcal{R}\{\psi, \psi^*\}$, i.e. it equals to the value of R at the eigenfunction.

Note that the Rayleigh quotient has the following important advantages. First, it allows one to cast the constrained minimization problem (with the constraint $\|\psi\| = 1$) into an unconstrained one. Second, it provides a way to compute the energy level self-consistently by the iterative method used for computation of the eigenfunction.

A. Rayleigh functional for a single order parameter

The stationary solutions of nonlinear systems can be found similarly as the solution of the above textbook problem. It is important that the nonlinear equation in question has a phase invariance resulting in the l_2 -norm conservation. For the following it is convenient to set the l_2 -norm of the stationary solution to 1, $\|f\| = 1$, which can be achieved by a scaling transformation (note that the chemical potential can also change, as in equations (25) and (27) of section III). Here and below we will use the variable f to denote the normalized functions, while ψ will be reserved for the arbitrary ones.

For the energy given by equation (1) the following functional can serve as the nonlinear generalization of the Rayleigh quotient:

$$\mathcal{R}\{\psi, \psi^*\} = E\{f, f^*\}|_{f=\frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|}} = \int d^n \vec{x} \mathcal{E} \left(\vec{x}, \frac{\psi(\vec{x}, t)}{\|\psi\|}, \frac{\psi^*(\vec{x}, t)}{\|\psi\|}, \frac{\nabla \psi(\vec{x}, t)}{\|\psi\|}, \frac{\nabla \psi^*(\vec{x}, t)}{\|\psi\|} \right). \quad (9)$$

Here the l_2 -norm $\|\psi\|$ is not fixed but is a functional of ψ and ψ^* . Note that \mathcal{R} is a compound functional: it depends on the complex conjugate but otherwise arbitrary functions $\psi(\vec{x})$ and $\psi^*(\vec{x})$ through the normalized ones, $f(\vec{x})$ and $f^*(\vec{x})$, used in the energy functional E .

The extremals of the Rayleigh functional (9) are stationary points of the corresponding nonlinear equation, equation (3) in this case, similar as in the case of the Rayleigh quotient (7) and equation (8). Let us show this. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{R} &= \int d^n\vec{x} \left\{ \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*} \delta f^* + \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f} \delta f \right\} \\ &= \int d^n\vec{x} \left\{ \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*} \frac{1}{\|\psi\|} \left(\delta\psi^* - \frac{\psi^*}{2\|\psi\|^2} \int d^n\vec{x} (\psi\delta\psi^* + \psi^*\delta\psi) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f} \frac{1}{\|\psi\|} \left(\delta\psi - \frac{\psi}{2\|\psi\|^2} \int d^n\vec{x} (\psi\delta\psi^* + \psi^*\delta\psi) \right) \right\}\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

where we have used that

$$\delta f = \frac{1}{\|\psi\|} \left\{ \delta\psi - \frac{\psi}{2\|\psi\|^2} \int d^n\vec{x} (\psi\delta\psi^* + \psi^*\delta\psi) \right\}.$$

By interchanging the order of integration in the double integral in formula (10) and gathering the terms with $\delta\psi^*$ we obtain the variational derivative

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{R}\{\psi, \psi^*\}}{\delta\psi^*} = \frac{1}{\|\psi\|} \left\{ \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*} - \operatorname{Re} \left(\int d^n\vec{x} \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*} f^* \right) f \right\} \Big|_{f=\frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|}}. \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) makes it is quite clear that the stationary points of equation (3) are extremals of the Rayleigh functional and vice versa. The corresponding chemical potential is equal to the integral in the second term on the r.h.s. of equation (11), i.e.

$$\mu = \operatorname{Re} \left(\int d^n\vec{x} \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*} f^* \right). \quad (12)$$

The latter fact can be verified by direct integration of equation (3), i.e. $\mu f = \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*}$, and taking into account the normalization of f . Equation (12) plays here the role of the expression for the energy level ε in the above problem of a quantum particle.

The Rayleigh functional also distinguishes the local minima among the stationary points. To see this let us compute its second variation. Assuming that ψ is a stationary point, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta^2\mathcal{R}\{\psi, \psi^*\} &= \left(\delta^2 E\{f, f^*\} \Big|_{\delta^2 f=0} + \int d^n\vec{x} \left\{ \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*} \delta^2 f^* + \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f} \delta^2 f \right\} \right) \Big|_{f=\frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|}} \\ &= \left(\delta^2 E\{f, f^*\} \Big|_{\delta^2 f=0} + \int d^n\vec{x} \{ \mu f \delta^2 f^* + \mu f^* \delta^2 f \} \right) \Big|_{f=\frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|}},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that f satisfies the stationary equation $\mu f = \frac{\delta E\{f, f^*\}}{\delta f^*}$. Integrating by parts and taking into account the normalization of f , i.e. $\delta \|f\|^2 = \delta \int d^n \vec{x} |f|^2 = 0$, we arrive at

$$\delta^2 \mathcal{R}\{\psi, \psi^*\} = \left(\delta^2 E\{f, f^*\} \Big|_{\delta^2 f=0} - 2\mu \int d^n \vec{x} |\delta f|^2 \right) \Big|_{f=\frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|}}. \quad (13)$$

The subscript in the first term on the l.h.s. of this equation means that the variable of variation of the energy functional is, in fact, $f(\vec{x})$. Taking this into account, one immediately recognizes on the r.h.s. of equation (13) the second variation of the functional $F_1\{f, f^*\}$ defined in equation (5) and evaluated in the space of normalized functions. Therefore, the minima of the Lagrange modified energy functional (for a fixed l_2 -norm) are also minima of the Rayleigh functional and vice versa. Importantly, the Rayleigh functional does not contain the zero solution $\psi = 0$ among its extremals, in contrast to the Lagrange modified energy functional.

B. Generalization to several order parameters

The Rayleigh functional was introduced above for the nonlinear system described by a single (complex-valued) function $\psi(\vec{x})$. However, it can be generalized to the case of more than one variable. For simplicity, consider the case of two variables $\vec{\psi} = (\psi_1, \psi_2)$. The definition of the Rayleigh functional will depend on the number of the normalization constraints. The latter number is determined by the type of phase invariance of the energy functional. There are two distinct cases. The first case realizes when the two order parameters are incoherently coupled, i.e., each one has a phase invariance of its own. In this case, there are two independent constraints corresponding to the two conserved l_2 -norms (the normalization is defined independently for each order parameter: $\|f_l\| = 1$, $l = 1, 2$). On the other hand, if the coupling is coherent, then there is only one constraint corresponding to conservation of the total l_2 -norm ($\|f_1\|^2 + \|f_2\|^2 = 1$).

An example of the incoherent coupling is the Gross-Pitaevskii functional for a two-species mixture of the degenerate quantum gases in an external trap below the condensation tem-

perature (see, for instance, Ref. [1]):

$$E_{\text{nc}}\{\psi_1, \psi_1^*, \psi_2, \psi_2^*\} = \int d^3\vec{x} \left\{ \sum_{l=1,2} N_l (|\nabla\psi_l|^2 + \lambda_l^2 \vec{x}^2 |\psi_l|^2) + \sum_{l,m=1}^2 \frac{g_{lm}}{2} N_l N_m |\psi_l|^2 |\psi_m|^2 \right\}. \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, the coupled-mode approximation for a Bose-Einstein condensate in the three dimensional parabolic trap modified in one dimension by a laser beam with creation of a central barrier illustrates the coherent coupling:

$$E_c\{\psi_1, \psi_1^*, \psi_2, \psi_2^*\} = N \int d^2\vec{x} \left\{ \sum_{l=1,2} \left(|\nabla\psi_l|^2 + \vec{x}^2 |\psi_l|^2 + \frac{g_l N}{2} |\psi_l|^4 \right) - \kappa (\psi_1 \psi_2^* + \psi_2 \psi_1^*) \right\} \quad (15)$$

(for derivation of the coupled-mode system and the applicability conditions consult Ref. [7]). The coupling coefficient κ is proportional to the tunnelling rate through the central barrier of the resulting double-well trap. It is easy to see that functional (14) admits two independent phase invariance transformations, $\psi_l \rightarrow e^{i\theta_l} \psi_l$, while functional (15) admits only the simultaneous phase invariance transformation of both variables with the same θ . The Rayleigh functionals for the two cases corresponding to equations (14) and (15) are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{nc}} = E_{\text{nc}} \left\{ \frac{\psi_1}{\|\psi_1\|}, \frac{\psi_1^*}{\|\psi_1\|}, \frac{\psi_2}{\|\psi_2\|}, \frac{\psi_2^*}{\|\psi_2\|} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{R}_c = E_c \left\{ \frac{\psi_1}{\|\vec{\psi}\|}, \frac{\psi_1^*}{\|\vec{\psi}\|}, \frac{\psi_2}{\|\vec{\psi}\|}, \frac{\psi_2^*}{\|\vec{\psi}\|} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where $\|\vec{\psi}\|^2 = \int d^n\vec{x} (|\psi_1|^2 + |\psi_2|^2)$. Further generalizations are straightforward.

It should be stressed that the correct normalization is determined by the most general phase invariance of the equations. The normalization by the total l_2 -norm in the incoherent coupling case would allow to find only the stationary solutions with the same chemical potential for each component of the order parameter, i.e. a very limited class of solutions.

The variational derivative of the Rayleigh functional \mathcal{R}_{nc} (16) is derived by a mere repetition of the steps which led to equation (11). We have

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{R}_{\text{nc}}}{\delta \psi_l^*} = \frac{1}{\|\psi_l\|} \left\{ \frac{\delta E_{\text{nc}}}{\delta f_l^*} - \text{Re} \left(\int d^3\vec{x} \frac{\delta E_{\text{nc}}}{\delta f_l^*} f_l^* \right) f_l \right\} \Big|_{\vec{f} = \left(\frac{\psi_1}{\|\psi_1\|}, \frac{\psi_2}{\|\psi_2\|} \right)}, \quad (17)$$

where, as usual, the f -variables are substituted in the energy functional instead of ψ -ones, i.e. $E_{\text{nc}} = E_{\text{nc}}\{f_1, f_1^*, f_2, f_2^*\}$. Now it is easy to see that, thanks to the equation $\mu_l f_l = \delta E_{\text{nc}} / \delta f_l^*$, the integral on the r.h.s. of formula (17) coincides with the corresponding chemical potential

μ_l . Thereby the extremals of the Rayleigh functional \mathcal{R}_{nc} are the stationary points of the corresponding nonlinear system of equations.

The variational derivative of the functional \mathcal{R}_c (16) can be most easily obtained from formula (11) by noticing that this Rayleigh functional depends on the function $\psi_l^*(\vec{x})$ through $f_l^* = \psi_l^*/\|\vec{\psi}\|$ and also through the total norm $\|\vec{\psi}\|$ in all other f -variables. Therefore, each variable of the energy functional leads to an integral term similar to the second term in equation (11) but multiplied by f_l . Hence the final result:

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{R}_c}{\delta \psi_l^*} = \frac{1}{\|\vec{\psi}\|} \left\{ \frac{\delta E_c}{\delta f_l^*} - \text{Re} \left(\int d^2 \vec{x} \sum_{m=1,2} \frac{\delta E_c}{\delta f_m^*} f_m^* \right) f_l \right\} \Bigg|_{\vec{f} = \frac{\vec{\psi}}{\|\vec{\psi}\|}}, \quad (18)$$

where $E_c = E_c\{f_1, f_1^*, f_2, f_2^*\}$. To show that the extremals of the Rayleigh functional \mathcal{R}_c are also the stationary points one has to use both stationary equations, i.e. $\mu f_1 = \delta E_{\text{nc}}/\delta f_1^*$ and $\mu f_2 = \delta E_{\text{nc}}/\delta f_2^*$, multiplied by the complex conjugate functions f_j^* . We get

$$\int d^2 \vec{x} \sum_{m=1,2} \frac{\delta E_c}{\delta f_m^*} f_m^* = \mu \int d^2 \vec{x} (|f_1|^2 + |f_2|^2) = \mu.$$

Let us find the second variation of the Rayleigh functional at a stationary point in both cases, the coherent and incoherent coupling. The derivation is similar to that for a single order parameter: one has to use the form of the stationary equations and the normalization constraints for the f -variables. In the incoherent case we obtain

$$\delta^2 \mathcal{R}_{\text{nc}} = \left(\delta^2 E_{\text{nc}}|_{\delta^2 \vec{f}=0} - 2 \sum_{m=1,2} \mu_m \int d^3 \vec{x} |\delta f_m|^2 \right) \Bigg|_{\vec{f} = \left(\frac{\psi_1}{\|\psi_1\|}, \frac{\psi_2}{\|\psi_2\|} \right)}, \quad (19)$$

while in the coherent case we have

$$\delta^2 \mathcal{R}_c = \left(\delta^2 E_c|_{\delta^2 \vec{f}=0} - 2\mu \int d^2 \vec{x} \sum_{m=1,2} |\delta f_m|^2 \right) \Bigg|_{\vec{f} = \frac{\vec{\psi}}{\|\vec{\psi}\|}}. \quad (20)$$

In both cases the second variation coincides with the second variation of the Lagrange modified energy functional considered in the space of normalized functions. Therefore, the minima of the Lagrange modified energy functional (for the fixed values of the conserved l_2 -norms) are also minima of the Rayleigh functional and vice versa.

Concluding this section we note that by introduction of the concept of Rayleigh functional we have converted the task of finding the stationary points to an unconstrained optimization problem which also distinguishes between the local minima and the saddle points. In the next section we give examples of application of the optimization method based on the Rayleigh functional to the numerical solution of some nonlinear equations of physics.

III. NUMERICAL SEARCH FOR THE STATIONARY POINTS

By complete analogy with the use of the Rayleigh quotient for the numerical optimization of the linear systems, the nonlinear optimization can be based on the Rayleigh functional. An heuristic argument in favor of such an optimization method, as compared, for instance, to the method of the penalized energy functional (for instance, the $F_1\{\psi, \psi^*\} = E\{\psi, \psi^*\} - \mu\|\psi\|^2$ of equation (5)) is as follows. The Rayleigh functional is a compound functional: the energy functional depends on $f(\vec{x})$ and $f^*(\vec{x})$, while the latter are functionals of $\psi(\vec{x})$ and $\psi^*(\vec{x})$. The numerical nonlinear optimization of a functional reduces to that of a smooth function (though of a large number of variables). But a function on a finite-dimensional sphere (which in the numerics plays the role of the variable $f(\vec{x})$) always has a minimum. Since the second variation of the Rayleigh functional is actually the second variation of the Lagrange modified energy functional evaluated in the space of normalized functions, the optimization method based on the Rayleigh functional has the capacity to return the absolute minimum. Generally, it converges to a local minimum. However, some particular choices of the initial profile for the order parameter may result in convergence to a nearest saddle point as if it were a minimum.

An additional argument in favor of the nonlinear optimization based on the Rayleigh functional is provided already by the imaginary time evolution method – a widely successful approach in the computational physics. Indeed, it is precisely the Rayleigh functional which is actually minimized in this method. Consider, for instance, the formulation given by equation (4) of section I. First of all, this formulation does not reflect the total change of ψ , since after each numerical step (or a several steps) one normalizes the function $\psi(\vec{x})$ directly. This means that the variational derivative $\delta E/\delta\phi^*$ does not tend to zero, since the norm of the order parameter is not forced to approach a constant value as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. However, one can reformulate the imaginary time evolution method for the variable $\phi(\vec{x}, \tau)$ which has a fixed l_2 -norm. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} \left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\psi\|} \psi \right) = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\psi\|} \left\{ \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau} - \frac{\psi}{2\|\psi\|^2} \int d^n\vec{x} \left(\psi \frac{\partial\psi^*}{\partial\tau} + \psi^* \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\tau} \right) \right\} \\ &= -\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\psi\|} \left\{ \frac{\delta E\{\phi, \phi^*\}}{\delta\phi^*} - \text{Re} \left(\int d^n\vec{x} \frac{\delta E\{\phi, \phi^*\}}{\delta\phi^*} \phi^* \right) \phi \right\} \Bigg|_{\phi = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\psi\|} \psi}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where we have used equation (4) to substitute for $\partial\psi/\partial\tau$. One immediately recognizes on

the r.h.s. of equation (21) the first variation of the Rayleigh functional (scaled by a constant \sqrt{N}),

$$\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\tau} = -\sqrt{N} \frac{\delta\mathcal{R}\{\psi, \psi^*\}}{\delta\psi^*}. \quad (22)$$

We see that if the imaginary time evolution method converges, i.e. if $\partial\phi/\partial\tau \rightarrow 0$, then it converges necessarily to an extremal of the Rayleigh functional corresponding to the nonlinear equation in question.

Equation (22), besides revealing a new side of the imaginary time evolution method, manifests its strong drawback: the order parameter evolves continuously and, hence, quite slowly, instead of performing a slalom-like down slide to a local minimum. This situation can be remedied by adopting a discrete minimization scheme with the order parameter performing a series of finite steps. We have naturally arrived at the steepest descent formulation:

$$\psi^{(k+1)} = \psi^{(k)} + D^{(k)}, \quad D^{(k)} \equiv -\frac{1}{\alpha_k} \frac{\delta\mathcal{R}\{\psi^{(k)}, \psi^{*(k)}\}}{\delta\psi^{*(k)}} \quad (23)$$

where the parameter α_k is selected by some line-search algorithm (recall that we use the normalization to 1, thus there is no scaling multiplier \sqrt{N} in front). More sophisticated gradient methods, for instance, the conjugate gradient method, can be employed for the finite-step minimization. Our point is that already the steepest descent algorithm performs very well in the nonlinear optimization based on the Rayleigh functional.

In selection of the parameter α_k we have adopted the Barzilai-Borwein two-point method [10] (see also Ref. [11, 12]). There are two closely related Barzilai-Borwein methods:

$$\alpha_k^{(1)} = \frac{\text{Re} \int d^n \vec{x} D^{*(k)} \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{R}^{(k)}}{\delta\psi^{*(k)}} - \frac{\delta\mathcal{R}^{(k-1)}}{\delta\psi^{*(k-1)}} \right)}{\int d^n \vec{x} |D^{(k)}|^2}, \quad (24a)$$

$$\alpha_k^{(2)} = \frac{\int d^n \vec{x} \left| \frac{\delta\mathcal{R}^{(k)}}{\delta\psi^{*(k)}} - \frac{\delta\mathcal{R}^{(k-1)}}{\delta\psi^{*(k-1)}} \right|^2}{\text{Re} \int d^n \vec{x} D^{*(k)} \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{R}^{(k)}}{\delta\psi^{*(k)}} - \frac{\delta\mathcal{R}^{(k-1)}}{\delta\psi^{*(k-1)}} \right)}, \quad (24b)$$

where we have rewritten the original formulation of Ref. [10] for a functional of the complex-valued function $\psi(\vec{x})$. Both methods are fairly equivalent in terms of performance. The generalization of the numerical scheme (23)-(24) to several order parameters is given by the substitution of the scalar function $\psi(\vec{x})$ by a vectorial one $\vec{\psi}(\vec{x})$ defined similar to the vectorial function $\vec{f}(\vec{x})$ used in formulae (17) and (18) (in the vector case, the inner product in equations (24a) and (24b) contains, besides the integral, the Hermitian inner product in the finite-dimensional target vector space).

In the numerical implementation we have used the spectral collocation method for the spatial grid based on the Fourier modes (consult, for instance, Refs. [13, 14, 15]). The accuracy of the obtained solution was checked by the direct numerical substitution into the governing equations. In all cases a rapid convergence to the stationary point was observed and the numerical simulations were stopped at the deviation error about 10^{-10} (the actual numerical error is thus given chiefly by that of the spatial grid, the latter decreases exponentially with the number of grid points). We have also substituted the negative values of the parameter α by a small positive number (we have used $1/\alpha = 10^{-8}$) to have the iteration step always in the direction of decrease of the Rayleigh functional.

Our first example of the numerical optimization based on the Rayleigh functional is calculation of the ground state in the two-species Bose-Einstein condensate of Rubidium in the quasi two-dimensional geometry (the pancake trap). The derivation of the governing equations and further discussion can be found in Ref. [9]. The energy functional for the two-species Bose-Einstein condensate is given by equation (14) with the substitution $d^3\vec{x} \rightarrow d^2\vec{x}$. The parameters λ_1 and λ_2 account for the different Lande magnetic factors. For the two isotopes of Rubidium we have: $\lambda_1^2 = 8/7$ (for ^{85}Rb) and $\lambda_2^2 = 6/7$ (for ^{87}Rb), while the interaction coefficients are $g_{11} = -0.0219$, $g_{22} = 0.0068$, and $g_{12} = 0.012$. The variational derivative is given by equation (17). Alternatively, one take the variational derivatives directly from the stationary Euler-Lagrange equations written for the normalized functions:

$$\mu_1 f_1 = N_1 (-\nabla^2 f_1 + \lambda_1^2 \vec{x}^2 f_1) + (g_{11} N_1^2 |f_1|^2 + g_{12} N_1 N_2 |f_2|^2) f_1, \quad (25a)$$

$$\mu_2 f_2 = N_2 (-\nabla^2 f_2 + \lambda_2^2 \vec{x}^2 f_2) + (g_{12} N_1 N_2 |f_1|^2 + g_{22} N_2^2 |f_2|^2) f_2. \quad (25b)$$

The chemical potentials μ_j are defined as follows: $\mu_j = \mu_{N_j} N_j$, $j = 1, 2$, with μ_{N_j} being the chemical potential for the order parameter ψ_j normalized to the number of atoms N_j .

A nontrivial feature of the two-species condensate is that the ground state suffers from the symmetry breaking transformation, if for instance, for a fixed number of atoms of the ^{85}Rb isotope the number of atoms of the ^{87}Rb isotope increases [9]. In figure 1 we show the symmetry preserving (axially symmetric) ground states, while the symmetry-breaking one is illustrated in figure 2. The axially symmetric states were found by the optimization method projected on the space of axially symmetric functions and formulated in the polar coordinates. The polar radius grid contained 128 points, while the two-dimensional grid

was 64×64 (we have used the 32×32 -grid to produce figure 2). The initial condition in both cases was the Gaussian profile (modulated by a symmetry-breaking perturbation in the case of figure 2). Our numerical simulations we performed in the MATLAB. The typical number of the iterations to reach the 10^{-10} convergence was between 400-1000 (on a personal computer with an AMD 1Ghz-processor the iterations have taken up to 5 seconds in the axially-symmetric case and up to 30 seconds in the 2D case).

As an example of the coherent coupling consider the following functional

$$E_c\{\psi_1, \psi_1^*, \psi_2, \psi_2^*\} = \int d^2\vec{x} \{ |\nabla\psi_1|^2 + |\nabla\psi_2|^2 + \vec{x}^2 (|\psi_1|^2 + |\psi_2|^2) + \varepsilon|\psi_2|^2 - \frac{N}{2}|\psi_1|^4 + \frac{aN}{2}|\psi_2|^4 - \kappa(\psi_1\psi_2^* + \psi_2\psi_1^*) \}, \quad (26)$$

which appears in description of the stationary states of a pair of repulsive and attractive ($a \geq 0$) two-dimensional condensates trapped in an asymmetric double-well potential [7] (in this case N is proportional to the actual number of condensate atoms with the coefficient of proportionality of the order $10^2 - 10^3$). Here ε is the zero-point energy difference between the two wells of the external trap and N is the total number of atoms. The Euler-Lagrange equations for the energy functional (26) read:

$$\mu f_1 = -\nabla^2 f_1 + \vec{x}^2 f_1 - \kappa f_2 - N|f_1|^2 f_1, \quad (27a)$$

$$\mu f_2 = -\nabla^2 f_2 + \varepsilon f_2 + \vec{x}^2 f_2 - \kappa f_1 + aN|f_2|^2 f_2, \quad (27b)$$

where μ coincides with the chemical potential for the order parameter normalized to the number of atoms N .

As in the previous example of the incoherent coupling, we have observed a rapid convergence of the iterations to the ground state solution. The numerical minimization was performed in the polar coordinates. The characteristic times to reach the deviation of about 10^{-10} are the same as in the previous example (formulated in the polar coordinates). To verify that the solutions obtained with the use of the Rayleigh functional method are indeed the ground states we have used another numerical approach which enable one to find all possible stationary states (consult for more details Refs. [7, 16]). The deformation of the ground state with variation of the zero-point energy difference is illustrated in figure 3, where the condensate of vanishing atomic interaction, $a = 0$, is tunnel-coupled to an attractive condensate. The ground states shown in this figure are stable with respect to collapse

and have the total number of atoms greater than the collapse threshold in the attractive condensate when the tunnel-coupling is negligible, i.e. for $\kappa = 0$.

In the above two examples we have been searching for the stationary states without nodes. However, the method applies equally well for the stationary solutions with nodes. For instance, the vortex solutions to the Gross-Pitaevskii equation can be found by our optimization method. To illustrate this consider the radially symmetric vortices in a two-dimensional Bose-Einstein condensate. They satisfy the following equation (in the dimensionless variables)

$$\mu f_n = - \left(\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} - \frac{n^2}{r^2} \right) f_n + V(r)f_n + gN|f_n|^2 f_n, \quad (28)$$

where the stationary solution is represented as $\psi_n(r, t) = e^{-i\mu t - in\theta} f_n(r)$ in the polar coordinates (r, θ) . Here the order parameter $f_n(r)$ is normalized to 1, n is the vorticity and N is the number of atoms. The r.h.s. of equation (28) is equal to the variational derivative $\delta E / \delta f_n$. Taking this into account and using equation (11) it is straightforward to construct the iteration scheme in the polar coordinates for the optimization method based the Rayleigh functional. The ground state ($n = 0$) and the first three vortex solutions in the parabolic potential $V = r^2$ are given in figure 4. As a startup approximation to the n -vortex solution we have used the function having the parity symmetry of the vortex: $f = r^n e^{-r^2}$. Rapid convergence to the vortex state was observed (after approximately 500 iterations the deviation was of the order 10^{-12}).

More complicated problem of finding the stationary vortex solutions in a nonlocal Gross-Pitaevskii equation, i.e. with the interaction of a finite range, can be solved by the Rayleigh based optimization method. In Ref. [18] both the radially symmetric and non-radial multi-vortices of the nonlocal Gross-Pitaevskii equation were found by the optimization based on the Rayleigh functional.

IV. RAYLEIGH FUNCTIONAL IN THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH

The ground state solution of a nonlinear partial differential equation can be degenerate. This degeneracy can make computation of the ground state a difficult problem. The numerical optimization method based on the Rayleigh functional cannot return all stationary states having the same number of particles and the same energy. If there are infinitely

many stationary points with equal energy and the same l_2 -norm the nonlinear optimization method based on the Rayleigh functional may not converge at all.

To clarify the above statement let us consider an explicit example. The ground state of the two-dimensional focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation is infinitely degenerate. Indeed, as is well-known (see, for instance, Refs. [2, 17]) the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation has a family of soliton solutions having the same l_2 -norm $\|\psi\|^2 \approx 11.69$ and a specific member $\psi = e^{it}R(\vec{x})$ satisfying the stationary equation

$$\nabla^2 R + R^3 - R = 0 \tag{29}$$

is called the Townes soliton. The stationary nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$\mu\psi + \nabla^2\psi + |\psi|^2\psi = 0 \tag{30}$$

admits the scale invariance given by $\psi(\vec{x}) \rightarrow k\psi(k\vec{x})$ and $\mu \rightarrow k^2\mu$. Easy to see that, in two spatial dimensions, the scale invariance preserves the l_2 -norm of the solution, while the energy of the stationary solution is exactly zero (see below). That is precisely why one cannot obtain the Townes soliton by the nonlinear optimization method based on the Rayleigh functional – the method fails to converge.

Interestingly though, this drawback of the Rayleigh functional in the numerical approach turns out into an advantage for the analytical analysis. Indeed, for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation it immediately leads to the identity

$$-\mu \int d^2\vec{x} |\psi|^2 = \int d^2\vec{x} |\nabla\psi|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2\vec{x} |\psi|^4, \tag{31}$$

which is satisfied by any stationary solution. Let us give the derivation. First of all, it is easy to see that the energy functional of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation $E = \int d^2\vec{x} (|\nabla\psi|^2 - |\psi|^4/2)$ has a scale invariance property: $E \rightarrow k^2E$ for $\psi(t, \vec{x}) \rightarrow k\psi(k^2t, k\vec{x})$. The invariance property is transferred to the Rayleigh functional: $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow k^2\mathcal{R}$. Differentiation of the latter with respect to the scale invariance factor k gives $\mathcal{R} = 0$ at the stationary point. Hence, the second equality in equation (31) follows. The first equality is derived by integration of the stationary equation multiplied by ψ^* and using the already proven equality. In the particular case when $\mu = -1$ we get the well-known identity for the Townes soliton.

As far as we know, the above given derivation of the identity (31) is the shortest one. More importantly, however, we have explicitly related this identity to the scale invariance property.

The scale invariance is responsible for the exact balance of energies in any stationary solution of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation: the kinetic energy is balanced by the energy due to the self-interaction.

V. CONCLUSION

Numerical search for the stationary points of nonlinear partial differential equations is a difficult problem. To tackle such a problem one is left to try various methods and choose the one which gives a better performance and accuracy. In this paper we have proposed a new numerical method, the nonlinear optimization method based on the Rayleigh functional. This method is a natural generalization of Poincaré’s minmax principle for the linear equations formulated with the use of the Rayleigh quotient.

It turns out that the nonlinear relaxation method called “the imaginary time evolution”, a widely used method in the computational physics, is just a special case of the proposed nonlinear optimization based on the Rayleigh functional. The simplicity of the Rayleigh functional and its universality for the nonlinear equations is one of the advantages of the method. Moreover, the method can distinguish between the local minima and saddle points, since the second variation of the Rayleigh functional is equal to the second variation of the Lagrange modified energy functional, if the latter is evaluated in the space of normalized functions. The Rayleigh functional itself takes care of the normalization of the dependent variables and, at the same time, fixes the normalization of the stationary solution to a preselected value. Other constraints, however, have to be treated in the usual way. The proposed method is useful in the search for the energy minimizers for a wide class of nonlinear partial differential equations, in particular, for those of the nonlinear Schrödinger type.

There are, however, some exceptional cases when the nonlinear optimization based on the Rayleigh functional may fail. The principal cause of the failure is the infinite degeneracy of the ground state solution to the nonlinear partial differential equation. Still, a failure in the numerics is partially compensated by the fact that the very degeneracy allows one to use the Rayleigh functional for derivation of some important identities satisfied by the stationary points.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the CNPq and FAPEAL of Brazil. The initial part of this work was done during the author's visit of the Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, in São Paulo, Brazil, which was supported by the FAPESP. The is grateful to Professor Jianke Yang for his critical reading of the manuscript.

- [1] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, *Bose-Einstein Condensation* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2003).
- [2] C. Sulem and P. L. Sulem, *The nonlinear Schrodinger equation: self-focusing and wave-collapse*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, **139**, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [3] R. Fletcher, *Practical Methods of Optimization* (2nd. Edition, Jonh Wiley & Sons, New York, 1987).
- [4] J. Nocedal, *Theory of Algorithms for Unconstrained Optimization*, Acta Numerica **199**, 242 (1992).
- [5] J. J. García-Ripoll and V. M. Pérez-García, *Optimizing Schrödinger functionals using Sobolev gradients: Applications to quantum mechanics and nonlinear optics*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **23**, 1315 (2001).
- [6] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics* (3rd edition, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1987).
- [7] V. S. Shchesnovich, S. B. Cavalcanti, *Stationary states in a pair of tunnel-coupled two-dimensional condensates with the scattering lengths of opposite sign*, to appear in *Progress in Soliton Research*, Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- [8] V. S. Shchesnovich, S. B. Cavalcanti, and R. A. Kraenkel, *Solitons in tunnel-coupled repulsive and attractive condensates*, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 033609 (2004).
- [9] V. S. Shchesnovich, A. M. Kamchatnov, and R. A. Kraenkel, *Mixed-isotope Bose-Einstein condensates in rubidium*, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 033601 (2004).
- [10] J. Barzilai and J. M. Borwein, *Two-point step gradient methods*, IMA J. Numer. Analys. **8**, 141 (1988).
- [11] M. Raydan, *The Barzilai and Borwein gradient method for the large scale unconstrained minimization problem*, SIAM J. Optim. **7**, 26 (1997).

- [12] R. Fletcher, *On the Barzilai-Borwein method*, Research Report Department of Mathematics, University of Dundee, 2001.
- [13] B. Fornberg, *A Practical Guide to Pseudospectral Methods*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press) 1996.
- [14] J. P. Boyd, *Chebyshev and Fourier Spectral Methods*, (Second ed., New York: DOVER Publications Inc.) 2000.
- [15] L. N. Trefethen, *Spectral Methods in Matlab*, (Philadelphia: SIAM) 2000.
- [16] V. S. Shchesnovich, B. A. Malomed, and R. A. Kraenkel, *Solitons in Bose-Einstein condensates trapped in a double-well potential*, *Physica D* **188**, 213 (2004).
- [17] G. Fibich and G. Papanicolaou, *Self-focusing in the perturbed and unperturbed nonlinear Schrödinger equation in critical dimension*, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **60**, 183 (1999).
- [18] V. S. Shchesnovich and R. A. Kraenkel, *Vortices in nonlocal Gross-Pitaevskii equation*, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37**, 6633 (2004).

VI. FIGURES




FIG. 1: The axially symmetric ground state of the two-isotope Bose-Einstein condensate mixture of Rubidium. The dashed and dotted lines give the order parameters (normalized to the actual number of atoms) of ^{85}Rb and ^{87}Rb isotopes, respectively. Panel (a) $N_{85} = N_{87} = 300$, $\mu_{85} = 1.18$ and $\mu_{87} = 2.67$; panel (b) $N_{85} = 200$, $N_{87} = 15000$, $\mu_{85} = 11.69$ and $\mu_{87} = 7.827$; panel (c) $N_{85} = N_{87} = 500$, $\mu_{85} = -3.48$ and $\mu_{87} = 3.08$ (in dimensionless units).




FIG. 2: The symmetry breaking ground state of the Bose-Einstein condensate mixture of the isotopes of Rubidium. The left and right panels give the shapes of the order parameters of ^{85}Rb and ^{87}Rb isotopes, respectively. Here $N_{85} = 150$, $N_{87} = 20000$, $\mu_{85} = 13.19$ and $\mu_{87} = 8.91$ (in dimensionless units).




FIG. 3: Deformation of the ground state of two Bose-Einstein condensates trapped in an asymmetric double-well potential with variation of the zero-point energy difference. The picture corresponds to the energy functional (26). Here $a = 0$, $\kappa = 1$ and $N = 15$, the solid line gives ψ_1 , while the dashed one ψ_2 .




FIG. 4: The ground state (dashed line) and first three radial vortices ($n = 1, 2, 3$) in a two-dimensional Bose-Einstein condensate. Here the interaction coefficient is scaled by the number of atoms, $gN = 1000$, while the order parameter is normalized to 1. The values of the chemical potential for the solutions are as follows: $\mu_0 = 25.36$, $\mu_1 = 25.68$, $\mu_2 = 26.35$, and $\mu_3 = 27.26$.