

Quantum phase fluctuations of a pair of interacting bosons or fermions in a symmetric double-well

Biswajit Das¹, Bitan Ghosal^{1*}, Subhasish Dutta Gupta² and Bimalendu Deb^{1,3}

¹ Department of Materials Science, ³ Raman Centre for Atomic, Molecular and Optical Sciences, Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Jadavpur, Kolkata 700032. INDIA. ² School of Physics, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad 500 046. INDIA.

Abstract. We introduce hermitian and unitary quantum phase operators of two-component fermionic fields. The phase operators of bosonic fields are the same as that of quantised radiation fields introduced long back. Using these phase operators we study quantum phase and number fluctuations of a pair of interacting bosons and those of a pair of interacting two-component fermions in a symmetric double-well potential. The fluctuations in inter-well number-difference operator can be quantified in terms of two-mode squeezing parameter which also serves as an entanglement parameter to quantify inter-well entanglement in number variables. We investigate the effects of on-site interaction on the fluctuations of the two canonically conjugate inter-well number- and phase-difference variables which are closely related to the entanglement. We also study intra-well number fluctuations. Our analytical and numerical results reveal that the fluctuation properties of a pair of bosons are quite distinct from that of a pair of two-component fermions. These findings may have implications in possible quantum information processing with ultracold atoms in confined geometries such as double-well optical lattices.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Lm,42.50.Lc,42.50.-p,37.10.Jk

1. Introduction

Quantum phase fluctuation of interacting systems plays an important role in describing a variety of physical phenomena such as phase transitions, superfluid tunneling, Josephson effects etc. With advancement in precision interferometry with ultracold atoms [1, 2, 3] in confined geometries such as traps and atom chips, developing a proper understanding of the quantum phase properties of interacting many-particle systems is of prime interest. As far as quantum phase measurement and its theoretical interpretations are concerned, there are unresolved issues which need to be addressed, in particular in the context of emerging field of atom optics. For instance, a proper definition of ‘quantum phase’ of electromagnetic fields had remained a hotly debated topic in theoretical quantum physics for a long time [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Accurate determination of phase difference between two optical fields in the quantum domain remains an elusive task due to lack of theoretical understanding of quantum phases. It is also known that such a difficulty exists even in the case of semi-classical radiation theory if the field is weak; and amplitude and phase fluctuations are correlated. About two decades ago, Mandel’s group [9, 10, 11, 12] experimentally examined two closely related but distinct measurement schemes for determining phase difference between two optical fields in both semi-classical and quantum cases. They made use of sine and cosine of phase difference operators as defined by Carruthers and Nieto [7]. Furthermore, to resolve the problems associated with quantum phase measurement, Noh *et al.* [9, 11] introduced an operational definition of quantum phase that requires different phase operators for different measurement schemes.

Quantum phase problems for electromagnetic fields had been extensively studied during 90’s [13]. However, in the context of matter waves or atom optics, quantum phase has not been addressed adequately. Physical situations in case of matter waves of ultracold atoms are different from that in electromagnetic radiation. Trapped ultracold atoms can be considered as an isolated interacting many-particle quantum system in the absence of any appreciable trap-loss. It is then necessary to formulate quantum phase of interacting matter waves with fixed total number of particles. This makes a major difference when one compares quantum phase of light with that of matter waves since the photons of light are noninteracting and their total number is not fixed. To understand the underlying features of quantum phase of an interacting massive system, we resort to a simple microscopic model of two particles interacting via a contact potential in the ground state of a symmetric 1-D double-well. There are several advantages of this model. First, this enables us to work with an analytical solution. Second, considering the fact that only phase difference between two modes of an electromagnetic field is measurable, analogously the ground states of two wells of a double-well can be regarded as two modes of matter waves. Third, this model allows us to study the effects of exchange symmetry of the two particles on quantum phase properties in a simple analytically tractable manner. This model can be readily generalised for optical lattice where one can study inter-site quantum phase fluctuations and their effects on Bose-

Hubbard physics [14, 15, 16, 17] and superfluid-Mott quantum phase transition [16]. Furthermore, since symmetric double-well potentials are important for revealing the importance of symmetry in a wide range of quantum dynamical systems starting from rotations of molecules to spontaneous symmetry breaking in quantum field theory, this model of quantum phase fluctuations may be connected to many areas of research. Single particle dynamics using ultracold atoms in a double-well has been studied in different contexts such as quantum tunneling [18, 19], Josephson oscillations [18], nonlinear self trapping [20, 21] of Bose-Einstein condensates, coherent control of tunneling [22] etc.

In recent times, quantum dynamics of an interacting atom-pair in a double-well has become important. Because, several experiments with ultracold atoms in a double-well potential have revealed significance of interaction in correlated atom-pair tunneling [2, 23], number squeezing [3] in a Bose Einstein condensate (BEC) and exploration of quantum magnetism [24] with cold atoms. Theoretical studies with interacting atoms in a double-well have demonstrated entanglement in atomic hyperfine spin and phase variables [25], an interplay between interaction and disorder in a BEC [26], operation of a quantum gate [27] and so on. With increasing use of double-wells in cold atom research, double-well optical lattice [28, 29, 30, 31] is emerging as an important tool for studying correlation effects in cold atoms [32]. With this perspective in interacting atoms in double-wells, quantum phase fluctuations are important for gaining new insight into correlation dynamics of cold atoms in such a confined geometry.

In this work, we address quantum phase problem for interacting bosons and a pair of interacting two-component fermions. In addressing this problem, we realise that, although the definition of a hermitian and unitary quantum phase of massive bosons will remain the same as that of photons, a proper quantum phase operator for fermions seems to be not available in the literature. Since in reality, only phase differences are measurable and not the absolute phase, we first introduce hermitian and unitary quantum-mechanical phase-difference operators of two-component fermions. In our double-well model, total number of particles is a constant of motion. In order to elucidate canonically conjugate nature of number-difference and phase-difference operators, we apply our formalism to study quantum fluctuations of both number- and phase-difference operators. One can introduce two non-commuting operators corresponding to the cosine and sine of the phase-difference operators. Both of them are canonically conjugate to the number-difference operators. These two phase operators plus the number-difference operator form a closed algebra. A unitary and hermitian phase-difference operator and corresponding phase-difference state can be constructed using the cosine and sine phase-difference operators. We find that the fluctuation in cosine of phase-difference of a pair of two-component fermions is greater than that of two bosons for otherwise same parameters for all times and for any arbitrary on-site interaction strength U . For both the bosonic and fermionic cases, the fluctuations in cosine of phase-difference tend to maximize with diminishing number-difference fluctuation in the limit $U \rightarrow \infty$ for times $t \ll h/U$ where h stands for Planck's constant. We also study on-site fluctuations to understand the bunching or anti-bunching properties of two particles

in a double-well and their possible connection with quantum phase fluctuations. On-site number fluctuation of two non-interacting bosons shows periodic anti-bunching behavior. In contrast, two non-interacting two-component fermions do not exhibit any number fluctuation. As interaction is switched on, in the low interaction regime, on-site fermionic number fluctuations show intriguing oscillatory bunching property with modulations, collapses and revivals. Collapses occur at some specific times depending on the ratio of U to the tunneling strength J . Counter-intuitively, on-site number fluctuation of an interacting pair of two-component fermions never exhibits any anti-bunching. In contrast, on-site number fluctuation of two interacting bosons shows strong anti-bunching behavior in the regime of low U . Oscillatory bunching behavior of two-component fermion-pair in the low or intermediate interaction regime implies interaction-induced correlated pair tunneling and consistent with similar tunneling effect for two-component bosons as experimentally observed by Bloch's group [2, 23]. The dynamical equations for a pair of two-component bosons and those of a pair of two-component fermions are the same. The reduced phase fluctuation in two-component fermions or two-component bosons as compared to that in single-component or spin-polarized bosons might be related to the oscillatory bunching or correlated tunneling in two-component case.

This paper is organised in the following way. In section 2, we present the formalism of two-mode quantum phase-difference operators. The model and its solution are described in section 3. The results are discussed in section 4. We conclude this paper in section 5.

2. Quantum Phase Operators

Before we discuss our model problems, we present here operator formalism that is particularly suitable for describing quantum phase fluctuations of bosons and fermions in a double-well. For bosons, a proper quantum mechanical phase operator can be defined following that for quantised radiation fields. For fermions, there exists no standard definition of a proper quantum mechanical phase operator. We here introduce a phase operator for fermions - this operator is hermitian and unitary. Before we discuss our new formalism, let us digress little bit and have a revisit into the history of quantum phase problem.

Dirac [4] first postulated the existence of a hermitian phase operator in his description of quantised electromagnetic fields. However, Dirac's phase operator is not unitary. Susskind-Glogower [6] introduced a new hermitian phase operator which was again non-unitary. Louisell [5] first introduced the periodic operator function in defining a phase variable conjugate to the angular momentum. Carruthers and Nieto [7] showed that one can define two hermitian phase operators C and S corresponding to cosine and sine of the classical phase, respectively. Using these operators, they introduced two-mode phase difference operators of a two-mode radiation field. Explicitly, the two-mode




Figure 1. Behavior of the fluctuation ΔC_{12}^B of the cosine of phase-difference (left panel) and the fluctuation ΔW^B of number-difference (right panel) as a function of dimensionless time $\tau = Jt$ for different values on-site dimensionless interaction strength $\bar{U} = U/J$. From top to bottom, the 4 subplots in both the panels correspond to $\bar{U} = 0$ (a,e), $\bar{U} = 0.5$ (b,f), $\bar{U} = 20$ (c,g) and $\bar{U} = 500$ (d,h), respectively. In the limit $\bar{U} \rightarrow \infty$, for $\tau \ll 1/\bar{U}$ we have $\Delta C_{12}^B \sim \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ and $\Delta W^B = 0$ meaning that number fluctuation is minimised while phase fluctuation is maximised in the large interaction regime in conformity with number-phase uncertainty.

phase-difference operators are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{CN}} &= \hat{C}_1 \hat{C}_2 + \hat{S}_1 \hat{S}_2 \\ \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{CN}} &= \hat{S}_1 \hat{C}_2 - \hat{S}_2 \hat{C}_1\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where

$$\hat{C}_i = \frac{1}{2}((\hat{N}_i + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_i + \hat{a}_i^\dagger (\hat{N}_i + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{S}_i = \frac{1}{2i}(\hat{N}_i + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_i - \hat{a}_i^\dagger (\hat{N}_i + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3)$$

are the phase operators corresponding to sine and cosine, respectively, of the i -th mode. In terms of creation (annihilation) operator \hat{a}_i^\dagger (\hat{a}_i) of the corresponding modes ($i = 1, 2$), phase difference operator can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{CN}} &= \frac{1}{2}[(\hat{N}_1 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_1 \hat{a}_2^\dagger (\hat{N}_2 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \hat{a}_1^\dagger (\hat{N}_1 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{N}_2 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_2] \\ \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{CN}} &= \frac{1}{2i}[(\hat{N}_1 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_1 \hat{a}_2^\dagger (\hat{N}_2 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \hat{a}_1^\dagger (\hat{N}_1 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{N}_2 + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_2]\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

The above cosine and sine phase-difference operators are non-hermitian and non-commuting. Pegg and Burnett [8] first introduced a hermitian and unitary phase operator. By synthesizing the methods of Pegg-Burnett [8] and Carruthers-Nieto, Deb

et al. [33] introduced hermitian and unitary phase-difference operators of a two-mode field with fixed number of total photons. What they did was to couple the vacuum state of one mode with the highest Fock state of the other to introduce the phase-difference operators of the form

$$\hat{C}_{12} = \hat{C}_{12}^{\text{CN}} + \hat{C}_{12}^{(0)} \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{S}_{12} = \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{CN}} + \hat{S}_{12}^{(0)} \quad (6)$$

where

$$\hat{C}_{12}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} [|N, 0\rangle\langle 0, N| + |0, N\rangle\langle N, 0|] \quad (7)$$

$$\hat{S}_{12}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2i} [|N, 0\rangle\langle 0, N| - |0, N\rangle\langle N, 0|] \quad (8)$$

describe the contributions from the vacuum states of the two modes. $|N_1, N - N_1\rangle$ represents a two-mode Fock state with N_1 and $N - N_1$ being the photon numbers in mode 1 and 2, respectively. In case of quantised electromagnetic fields, the assumption of a fixed number of photons is made to circumvent the problem of non-unitarity. However, after all calculations are done one has to take the limit that the number of photons goes to infinity.

2.1. Quantum phase operators of bosons in a double-well

Here we discuss quantum phase operators for massive particles in a double-well potential. Since it is possible to keep the total number of particles in a double-well fixed in the absence of any loss, the assumption of a fixed total number of quanta (in this case, the total number of particles) is a good one unlike that in electromagnetic fields. We consider that the two modes 1 and 2 correspond to the second quantised matter wave fields to the left and right well, respectively, of a double-well potential, and the operators \hat{a}_i (\hat{a}_i^\dagger) represents annihilation (creation) operator of a particle in left ($i = 1$ and right well ($i = 2$)). Then the operators defined in equations (5) and (6) suffice to be the two-mode phase-difference operators of bosons in a double-well potential corresponding to the cosine and sine, respectively, of the two-mode phase-difference. Thus we have $\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{B}} \equiv \hat{C}_{12}$ and $\hat{S}_{12}^{\text{B}} \equiv \hat{S}_{12}$ where the superscript B stands for boson. The difference of the number operators or the population imbalance between the two wells is $\hat{W}^{\text{B}} = \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_1 - \hat{a}_2^\dagger \hat{a}_2$. The three operators \hat{C}_{12}^{B} , \hat{S}_{12}^{B} and \hat{W}^{B} operators obey closed cyclic commutation algebra as follows

$$\left[[\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{B}}, \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{B}}], \hat{W}^{\text{B}} \right] + \left[[\hat{S}_{12}^{\text{B}}, \hat{W}^{\text{B}}], \hat{C}_{12}^{\text{B}} \right] + \left[[\hat{W}^{\text{B}}, \hat{C}_{12}^{\text{B}}], \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{B}} \right] = 0 \quad (9)$$

The commutation algebra of the given operators are following

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{B}}, \hat{W}^{\text{B}} \right] &= 2i \left(\hat{S}_{12}^{\text{B}} - (N + 1) \hat{S}_{12}^{(0)} \right) \\ \left[\hat{S}_{12}^{\text{B}}, \hat{W}^{\text{B}} \right] &= -2i \left(\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{B}} - (N + 1) \hat{C}_{12}^{(0)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$




Figure 2. Same as in figure 1 but for a pair of two-component fermions. From top to bottom, the subplots correspond to $\bar{U} = 0$ (a,e), $\bar{U} = 0.5$ (b,f), $\bar{U} = 20$ (c,g) and $\bar{U} = 500$ (d,h), respectively. In the limit $\bar{U} \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta C_{12}^F \sim \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ and $\Delta W^F = 0$.

One can define a unitary phase-difference operator

$$\hat{\beta}_{12} = \hat{C}_{12}^B + i\hat{S}_{12}^B. \quad (11)$$

The eigenstate of this operator, that is, phase-difference state can be constructed as the product of single-mode phase states of Pegg-Burnett [8] subject to the condition that total number of quanta in the two modes is a constant of motion. The procedure for deriving phase-difference state is described in references [33, 34]. The important point to be noted here is that for low number of total bosons N , the effect of vacuum states such as $|0, N\rangle$ and $|N, 0\rangle$ on quantum phase-difference would be significant. Therefore, in case of low N , one has to use unitary quantum phase-difference operators as defined in equation (11) for accurate measurement of quantum phases. The phase-difference operators of Carruthers and Nieto will approach unitarity in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. In a recent theoretical paper by Sarma and Zhou [26], an operator similar to that of Carruthers and Nieto has been implicitly used for studying phase dynamics of a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) in a double-well. It is worthwhile to mention that while in case of BEC, probably a non-unitary phase operator such as used in [26] can suffice for phase measurement for all practical purpose, a few bosons in a double well necessarily require unitary phase difference operators for high precision phase measurement, in particular for the purpose quantum information processing with a few bosons in a double-well.

2.2. Quantum phase operators of a pair of two-component fermions in a double-well

Here we define quantum phase operator for fermions. The operators corresponding to the cosine and sin of two-mode phase-difference of a system of two-component fermions with spin up and down components can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{F}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 = \uparrow, \downarrow} \hat{C}_{1\sigma_1 2\sigma_2}^{\text{F}} \\ \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{F}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 = \uparrow, \downarrow} \hat{S}_{1\sigma_1 2\sigma_2}^{\text{F}}\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_{1\uparrow 2\downarrow}^{\text{F}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{1\uparrow} \hat{a}_{2\downarrow}^\dagger (\hat{N}_{2\downarrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \hat{a}_{1\uparrow}^\dagger (\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times (\hat{N}_{2\downarrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{2\downarrow} \right] + \frac{1}{2} [| \uparrow \downarrow 0 \rangle \langle 0 \uparrow \downarrow | + | 0 \uparrow \downarrow \rangle \langle \uparrow \downarrow |]\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}_{1\uparrow 2\downarrow}^{\text{F}} &= \frac{1}{2i} \left[(\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{1\uparrow} \hat{a}_{2\downarrow}^\dagger (\hat{N}_{2\downarrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \hat{a}_{1\uparrow}^\dagger (\hat{N}_{1\uparrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times (\hat{N}_{2\downarrow} + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{a}_{2\downarrow} \right] + \frac{1}{2i} [| \uparrow \downarrow 0 \rangle \langle 0 \uparrow \downarrow | - | 0 \uparrow \downarrow \rangle \langle \uparrow \downarrow |]\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

Here $\hat{a}_{i\sigma}$ ($\hat{a}_{i\sigma}^\dagger$) is the fermion annihilation (creation) operator of spin component σ in the i -th mode. Similarly, the other two operators $\hat{C}_{1\downarrow 2\uparrow}^{\text{F}}$ and $\hat{S}_{1\downarrow 2\uparrow}^{\text{F}}$ can be defined.

The fermion population imbalance operator is given by

$$\hat{W}^{\text{F}} = \sum_{\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow} (\hat{N}_{1\sigma} - \hat{N}_{2\sigma}) = \sum_{\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow} (\hat{a}_{1\sigma}^\dagger \hat{a}_{1\sigma} - \hat{a}_{2\sigma}^\dagger \hat{a}_{2\sigma})\quad (15)$$

The operators \hat{C}_{12}^{F} , \hat{S}_{12}^{F} and \hat{W}^{F} obey the closed commutation algebra

$$\left[[\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{F}}, \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{F}}], \hat{W}^{\text{F}} \right] + \left[[\hat{S}_{12}^{\text{F}}, \hat{W}^{\text{F}}], \hat{C}_{12}^{\text{F}} \right] + \left[[\hat{W}^{\text{F}}, \hat{C}_{12}^{\text{F}}], \hat{S}_{12}^{\text{F}} \right] = 0\quad (16)$$

A unitary phase-difference operator for a pair of two-component fermions in the ground state of symmetric double-well potential can be written as

$$\hat{\phi}_r = \hat{C}_{12}^{\text{F}} + i\hat{C}_{12}^{\text{F}}\quad (17)$$

and corresponding eigen phase-difference state can be obtained in a similar manner as in bosonic case with $N = 2$.

3. Model and its solution

As a model system, we consider a pair of interacting particles in the ground state of a symmetric double-well potential with a finite barrier but infinite side walls. The interaction is assumed to be of zero-ranged contact type. We describe quantum dynamics of two cases: (1) A pair of indistinguishable bosons, and (2) A pair of two-component fermions. The bosonic model we use here is similar to the one studied by Longhi [38] who has shown that the average dynamical behavior of a pair of hard-core bosons in a




Figure 3. The left panel shows the variation of fluctuation of the sine of phase-difference ΔS_{12}^B as a function τ for the bosonic case while the right panel exhibits the fermionic counterpart of the same. From top to bottom, subplots correspond to $\bar{U} = 0$ (a,e), $\bar{U} = 0.5$ (b,f), $\bar{U} = 20$ (c,g) and $\bar{U} = 500$ (d,h), respectively.

symmetric double-well has a classical counterpart in the transport of electromagnetic waves through wave-guide arrays. However, such an analogy can not be drawn for fermions in general.

3.1. Two Bosons

The Hamiltonian of a system of N interacting bosons occupying two weakly coupled lowest states of a symmetric double well potential is given by

$$\hat{H} = -\hbar J(\hat{a}_l^\dagger \hat{a}_r + \hat{a}_r^\dagger \hat{a}_l) + \frac{\hbar U}{2}(\hat{a}_l^{\dagger 2} \hat{a}_l^2 + \hat{a}_r^{\dagger 2} \hat{a}_r^2) \quad (18)$$

where $\hat{a}_{l,r}$ ($\hat{a}_{l,r}^\dagger$) are the bosonic particle annihilation (creation) operators for the two sites l (left) and r (right) of the double well, $J > 0$ accounts for the hopping or tunneling between the two sites and U is the on-site interaction. The wave function $|\psi(t)\rangle$ in the basis of Fock states with fixed total particle number N can be written as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{n_l=0}^N c_{n_l}(t) |n_l, N - n_l\rangle \quad (19)$$

Where $c_{n_l}(t)$ is the probability amplitude to find n_l particles in the left well and $(N - n_l)$ particles in the right well and $|n_l, N - n_l\rangle$ denote Fock state with n_l particle at the left site and $N - n_l$ particle at the right site. From schrödinger equation, we obtain

$$i \frac{dc_l(t)}{dt} = -(\kappa_l c_{l+1} + \kappa_{l-1} c_{l-1}) + V_l c_l \quad (20)$$

where $\kappa_l = J\sqrt{(l+1)(N-l)}$, $V_l = \frac{U}{2}[l^2 + (N-l)^2 - N]$ and the normalization condition is $\sum_{l=0}^N |c_l(t)|^2 = 1$.

In the special case of $N = 2$, the solution is simple and analytically tractable. For instance, let us consider the initial condition $c_0(0) = 1$ and $c_1(0) = c_2(0) = 0$ i.e. both particles are initially in the right well. One then obtains

$$c_i(t) = c_i(0) + \sqrt{2} \left[C \frac{\exp[i\Omega_B^- \tau] - 1}{\Omega_B^-} - D \frac{\exp[-i\Omega_B^+ \tau] - 1}{\Omega_B^+} \right] \quad (21)$$

$$c_1(t) = C \exp[i\Omega_B^- \tau] + D \exp[-i\Omega_B^+ \tau] \quad (22)$$

where subscript i stands for either 0 or 2, $\bar{U} = U/J$, $\tau = Jt$, $\Omega_B = \sqrt{4 + (\bar{U}/2)^2}$, $\Omega_B^\pm = \Omega_B \pm \bar{U}/2$, $C = \frac{1}{2\Omega_B}[\Omega_B^- c_1(0) + \sqrt{2}\{c_2(0) + c_0(0)\}]$, and $D = \frac{1}{2\Omega_B}[\Omega_B^+ c_1(0) - \sqrt{2}\{c_2(0) + c_0(0)\}]$. Assuming initial condition $c_0(0) = 1$ and $c_1(0) = c_2(0) = 0$, i.e. both bosons are initially in the right well, we get $C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\Omega_B}$ and $D = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\Omega_B}$. Note that these solutions are the same as in [38].

3.2. Two Fermions

The dynamical behavior of two fermions in a symmetric double-well potential is described here. Since fermions obey Pauli exclusion principle, more than one particle can not be accommodated in a single quantum state. Here we deal only two-component fermions, one with spin up and another with spin down. The Hamiltonian of the system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} = & -J\hbar(\hat{a}_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\uparrow} + \hat{a}_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\uparrow} + \hat{a}_{l\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\downarrow} + \hat{a}_{r\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\downarrow}) \\ & + \frac{U\hbar}{2}(\hat{a}_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\downarrow} \hat{a}_{l\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{l\uparrow} + \hat{a}_{r\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\downarrow} \hat{a}_{r\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{r\uparrow}) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Now, we consider our trial wave function as a linear superposition of the Fock states as follows,

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \frac{c_1(t)}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle) + c_2(t)|\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle + c_3(t)|0, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle \quad (24)$$

where the states $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$, $|\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle$ define one fermion in the left well and another in right well and $|\uparrow\downarrow, 0\rangle$, $|0, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ define both fermions are in the left well and right well respectively. Here $c_1(t)$, $c_2(t)$ and $c_3(t)$ are the probability amplitudes of finding one fermion in one well, both fermions in the left and in the right well respectively. Now, putting equation (25) and (26) into Schrödinger equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} i\frac{dc_1}{dt} &= -\sqrt{2}J(c_2 + c_3) + \frac{U}{2}c_1 \\ i\frac{dc_2}{dt} &= -\sqrt{2}Jc_1 + \frac{U}{2}c_2 \\ i\frac{dc_3}{dt} &= -\sqrt{2}Jc_1 + \frac{U}{2}c_3 \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

By solving equation (27), we get

$$c_1(t) = A \exp[i\Omega_F^- \tau] + B \exp[-i(\Omega_F^+ \tau)] \quad (26)$$

$$c_j(t) = c_j(0) + \sqrt{2} \left[A \frac{\exp[i\Omega_F^- \tau] - 1}{\Omega_F^-} - B \frac{\exp[-i\Omega_F^+ \tau] - 1}{\Omega_F^+} \right] \quad (27)$$

where subscript j stands for either 2 or 3, $\Omega_F = \sqrt{4 + (\bar{U}/4)^2}$, where $\Omega_F^\pm = \Omega_F \pm \bar{U}/4$, $A = \frac{1}{2\Omega_F} [\Omega_F^- c_1(0) + \sqrt{2}\{c_2(0) + c_3(0)\}]$ and $B = \frac{1}{2\Omega_F} [\Omega_F^+ c_1(0) - \sqrt{2}\{c_2(0) + c_3(0)\}]$. Assuming initial condition $c_3(0) = 1$ and $c_1(0) = c_2(0) = 0$, i.e. both fermions are initially in the right well, we get $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\Omega_F}$ and $B = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\Omega_F}$.

4. Results and discussions

Corresponding to the cosine and sine of the two-mode phase-difference operators for two bosons in the double-well, equation (10) governs the number-phase uncertainties between the number-difference and either of the two phase operators related to cosine and sine of the two-well phase-difference. Number-difference fluctuation $\Delta\hat{W}_{12}^B$ is closely related to the two-mode squeezing parameter which in turn describes entanglement between two bosonic modes in terms of number variables. Therefore, quantum phase fluctuation is also related to the two-mode entanglement. The entanglement between the two wells in number variables can be quantified as the two-mode squeezing [35] or entanglement [36, 37] parameter.

$$\xi_n = (\Delta(\hat{n}_l - \hat{n}_r))^2 / (\langle \hat{n}_l \rangle + \langle \hat{n}_r \rangle) = \frac{(\Delta\hat{W}_{12}^B)^2}{N} \quad (28)$$

The two wells (two modes) become entangled when ξ_n is less than unity, or equivalently, when $\Delta\hat{W}_{12}^B$ becomes less than \sqrt{N} . For two bosons in the double-well, this parameter becomes

$$\xi_n^B = 2 \left[1 - \frac{2}{\Omega_B^2} \sin^2(\Omega_B \tau) - \frac{1}{4\Omega_B^2} (\Omega_B^- \cos(\Omega_B^+ \tau) - \Omega_B^+ \cos(\Omega_B^- \tau))^2 \right] \quad (29)$$

We display the temporal evolution of $\Delta\hat{C}_{12}^B$ for different \bar{U} values in the left panel of figure 1. We assume that both bosons are initially in the right well. The right panel of figure 1 shows variation of $\Delta\hat{W}^B$ as a function of τ . The two wells are entangled if $\Delta W^B < \sqrt{2}$. From figure 1 we notice that when bosons are noninteracting ($\bar{U} = 0$), the number-difference fluctuation periodically oscillates between zero and $\sqrt{2}$ meaning that the two wells remain entangled for all the times. When $\Delta\hat{W}^B = 0$, two wells are perfectly entangled. In noninteracting case, perfect entanglement varies periodically with a period of $\pi/2$. With the increase of interaction strength \bar{U} , the time periodicity of perfect entanglement increases. In the large \bar{U} limit, we have $\Delta\hat{W}^B \simeq 0$ for the times $\tau \ll 1/\bar{U}$ meaning that the two bosons become localised for long times. Now, in which well the two bosons will be localised depends on the initial condition. For instance, if the two bosons are initially in the right well, then the bosons will remain localised in the right well in the large \bar{U} regime. As \bar{U} increases $\Delta\hat{C}_{12}^B$ start rapidly oscillating. The mean value of $\Delta\hat{C}_{12}^B$ increases with the increase of \bar{U} . In the limit $\bar{U} \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta\hat{C}_{12}^B$ settles down at a value $\sqrt{3}/2$ for times $\tau \ll 1/\bar{U}$.

Let us now discuss number and phase fluctuations in fermionic case. The entanglement parameter in one spin (σ) component of fermions can be expressed as

$$\xi_{n,\sigma}^F = 1 - \frac{1}{4\Omega_F^2} [\Omega_F^- \cos(\Omega_F^+ \tau) - \Omega_F^+ \cos(\Omega_F^- \tau)]^2 \quad (30)$$

The fermion entanglement parameter ξ_n^F in terms of total fermion number fluctuation is given by

$$\xi_n^F = 2 \left[1 - \frac{2}{\Omega_F^2} \sin^2(\Omega_F \tau) - \frac{1}{4\Omega_F^2} [\Omega_F^- \cos(\Omega_F^+ \tau) - \Omega_F^+ \cos(\Omega_F^- \tau)]^2 \right] \quad (31)$$

The fluctuations of the phase-difference and population imbalance are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta \hat{C}_{12}^F)^2 &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}(c_2^2 + c_3^2) + \frac{1}{4}(c_2^* c_3 + c_3^* c_2) - \frac{1}{2}(c_2^* c_3 + c_3^* c_2)^2 \\ (\Delta \hat{S}_{12}^F)^2 &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}(c_2^2 + c_3^2) - \frac{1}{4}(c_2^* c_3 + c_3^* c_2) + \frac{1}{2}(c_2^* c_3 - c_3^* c_2)^2 \\ (\Delta \hat{W}^F)^2 &= 4 [(c_2^2 + c_3^2) - (c_2^2 - c_3^2)^2] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Figure 2 is a fermionic counter-part of figure 1 showing the phase-difference and number-difference fluctuations for the same parameters as in figure 1. While number-difference fluctuation $\Delta \hat{W}_{12}^F$ shows almost similar temporal behavior as in bosonic case, phase-difference fluctuation $\Delta \hat{C}_{12}^F$ is strikingly different from that of bosons. $\Delta \hat{C}_{12}^F$ is always smaller than that of bosons for a particular value of \bar{U} . However, in the limit $\bar{U} \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta \hat{C}_{12}^F$ settles down at $\sqrt{3}/2$ as in bosonic case. In the low interaction regimes, temporal evolution of number-difference fluctuations in both bosonic and fermionic cases shows intriguing interference pattern with modulations due to two times scales which are J and U .

We plot the fluctuation of the sine of phase-difference $\Delta \hat{S}_{12}^q$ for both bosonic ($q \equiv B$) and fermionic ($q \equiv F$) cases in figure 3. We have verified that $\Delta \hat{C}_{12}^q$ and $\Delta \hat{S}_{12}^q$ satisfy the uncertainty conditions for both bosonic and fermionic cases.

Next, in order to understand how on-site number fluctuations behave in bosonic and fermionic cases, we quantify the on-site number fluctuations in terms of Mandel Q parameter which is well known in quantum optics and serves as an important figure of merit for characterizing quantum statistical properties of light. For bosons in a double-well we define Q parameter as $Q_s^B = \langle (\Delta \hat{n}_s)^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{n}_s \rangle$, where $s = l, r$ stands for either left (l) or right (r) well. Q characterises deviation of particle distribution from Poissonian statistics for which $Q = 0$. Sub-Poissonian (super-Poissonian) statistics corresponding to $Q < 0$ ($Q > 0$) implies anti-bunching (bunching) of the particles. Let us Assume that both the bosons are initially in the right well. Then, in a very low interaction regime ($\bar{U} \rightarrow 0$), we have $Q_l^B(\tau) \simeq -\frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{4} \cos(4\tau) + \cos(2\tau)$ and $Q_r^B(\tau) \simeq -\frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\tau)$. This implies that in the low interaction regimes, on-site Mandel Q parameter is always less than or equal to zero. $Q < 0$ implies non-classical behavior. For $2\tau = (2n + 1)\pi$ or equivalently $\tau = (n + 1/2)\pi$ we have $Q_l^B \simeq -2$ and $Q_r^B \simeq 0$. This means that at these specific times, number fluctuation in one well exhibits maximum non-classical behavior while that in the other well number fluctuation lies at coherent level ($Q = 0$). In a very




Figure 4. Mandel Q parameter Q_l for on-site number fluctuation in the left well as function of τ for bosons (left panel) and fermions (right panel) for $\bar{U} = 0$ (a,e), $\bar{U} = 0.05$ (b,f), $\bar{U} = 0.1$ (c,g) and $\bar{U} = 50$ (d,h).

high interaction regime ($\bar{U} \rightarrow \infty$), we find $Q_l^B \simeq 1 - \frac{\bar{U}^2}{16 + \bar{U}^2} \rightarrow 0$, $Q_r^B \simeq -1 - \frac{\bar{U}^2}{16 + \bar{U}^2} \rightarrow -2$. This means that the two bosons become localised in the right well for ever. In case of double-well lattice model, this will correspond to a Mott insulator phase with 2 bosons at each right lattice site.

Number fluctuation of fermions in the s -th ($s \equiv l, r$) well may be characterized by $Q_s^F(\tau) = \langle \hat{n}_{s\uparrow} \hat{n}_{s\downarrow} \rangle - \langle \hat{n}_{s\uparrow} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_{s\downarrow} \rangle$. In very low ($\bar{U} \rightarrow 0$) interaction regime, the fluctuation quantities behave as $Q_l^F(\tau) \rightarrow 0$, $Q_r^F(\tau) \rightarrow 0$. In very high ($\bar{U} \rightarrow \infty$) interaction regime, all fluctuation quantities also go to zero. These analytical results are further corroborated by numerical results shown in figure 4 where we plot the variation Mandel Q parameter as a function of time for both fermionic and bosonic cases. Figure 4 shows that two-component fermions never shows any on-site anti-bunching. With increase of U , a pair of two-component fermions exhibit on-site bunching. In contrast noninteracting bosons shows periodic anti-bunching and coherent behavior, as \bar{U} increases bosons exhibit both anti-bunching and bunching behavior at different times. Figure 4 indicate that while phase coherence (low U regime) in case of fermions may be related to coherent behavior, that in case of bosons appears to be related to non-classical non-Poissonian (anti-bunching) behavior.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion we have introduced quantum phase operators for two-component fermion fields in ground state of a symmetric double-well. Using the quantum phase operators we have studied in detail the effects of on-site interaction on quantum phase and number

fluctuation properties of two interacting bosons and a pair two-component fermions in a double-well potential. Our results reveal the effects of on-site interaction on dynamical evolution of squeezing in phase or number variables of a pair of interacting particles in a symmetric double-well system. This may be of interest to characterize quantum entanglement in continuous variables in confined geometries. A pair of two-component fermions interacting via a contact-potential in a symmetric double-well has average dynamical character that is qualitatively similar to that of a pair of bosons. Our study on two-mode quantum phase and number fluctuations reveal that these fluctuation parameters can clearly distinguish between two bosons from a pair of two-component fermions in otherwise similar physical conditions. In terms of number variables, both bosonic and fermionic systems exhibit interesting inter-well entanglement properties which may be a potential resource for future quantum information processing with neutral atoms in double-well optical lattices. Our results indicate that the correlated tunneling of a pair of atoms with two spin components as experimentally observed by Chen *et al.* [23] are related to bunching behavior with reduced inter-well quantum phase fluctuations. With the first demonstration of homo-dyne detection of a fluctuating continuous variable of matter waves by Gross *et al.* [39] last year, it might be possible in near future to perform experiments on the measurement of quantum phases of matter waves in a similar manner as in Mandel's experiments that require homo-dyne or hetero-dyne detection of weak signals.

6. Acknowledgment

Biswajit Das is thankful to the Council of Scientific & Industrial Research (CSIR), Govt. of India, for a support.

* Present address: Bhaba Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai 400085, INDIA.

References

- [1] Shin Y, Saba M, Pasquini T A, Ketterle W, Pritchard D E and Leanhardt A E 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** 5
- [2] Foelling S, Trotzky S, Cheinet P C, Feld M, Saers R, Widera A, Mueller T and Bloch I 2007 *Nature* **448** 1029
- [3] Sebby-Strabley J , Brown B L, Anderlini M, Lee P J, Phillips W D and Porto J V 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** 200405
- [4] Dirac P A M 1927 *Proc. R. Soc. A* **114** 243
- [5] Louisell W H 1963 *Phys. Lett.* **7** 60
- [6] Susskind L and Glogower J 1964 *Physics* **1** 49
- [7] Carruthers P, Nieto M M *Rev. Mod. Phys* **40** 2
- [8] Barnett S M and Pegg D T 1986 *J. Phys. A* **19** 3849
- [9] Noh J W, Fougères A and Mandel L 1991 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** 11
- [10] Noh J W, Fougères A and Mandel L 1992 *Phys. Rev. A* **45** 1
- [11] Noh J W, Fougères A and Mandel L 1993 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71** 16
- [12] Noh J W, Fougères A and Mandel L 1994 *Phys. Rev. A* **49** 1
- [13] Peřinova V, Lukš A and Peřina J 1998 *Phase in Optics* (World Scientific)

- [14] Fisher M P A, Weichman P B, Grinstein G and Fisher D S 1989 *Phys. Rev. B* **40** 546
- [15] Sheshadri K, Krishnamurthy H R, Pandit R and Ramakrishnan T V 1993 *Europhys. Lett.* **22** 257-263
- [16] Greiner M, Mandel O, Esslinger T, Hansch T W and Bloch I 2002 *Nature* **415** 39-44
- [17] Jaksch D, Breigel H, Cirac J, Gardiner C and Zoller P 1999 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** 1975
- [18] Albiez M *et al.* 2005 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** 010402
- [19] Milburn G J, Corney J, Wright E M and Walls D F 1997 *Phys. Rev. A* **55** 4318
- [20] Anker T *et al.* 2005 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** 020403
- [21] Javanainen J 1986 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** 3164
- [22] Kierig E, Schnorrberger U, Schietinger A, Tomkovic J and Oberthaler M K 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 190405
- [23] Chen Y-A, Nascimbene, Aidelsburger S M, Atala M, Trotzky S, Bloch I. 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** 210405
- [24] Trotzky S *et al.* 2008 *Science* **319** 295-299
- [25] Barmettler P, Rey A-M, Demler E, Lukin M D, Bloch I, Gritsev V 2008 *Phys. Rev. A* **78** 012330
- [26] Zhou Q and Sarma S D 2010 *Phys. Rev. A* **82** 041601 (R)
- [27] Foot C J, Shotter M D 2011 *Am. J. Phys.* **79** 7
- [28] Anderlini M, Sebby-Strabley J, Kruse J, Porto J V and Phillips W D 2006 *J. Phys. B : At. Mol. Opt. Phys* **39** S199-S210
- [29] Sebby-Strabley J, Anderlini M, Jessen P S and Porto J V 2006 *Phys. Rev. A* **73** 033605
- [30] Stojanovic V M, Wu C, Liu V and Sarma S D 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** 125301
- [31] Lee P J, Anderlini M, Brown B L, Sebby-Strabley J, Phillips W D and Porto J V 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** 020402
- [32] Anderlini M *et al.* 2007 *Nature* **448** 452-456
- [33] Deb B, Gangopadhyay G and Ray D S 1993 *Phys. Rev. A* **48** 2
- [34] Deb B 1996 Ph. D. thesis (unpublished)
- [35] Barnett S M and Radmore P M 1997 *Methods in Theoretical Quantum Optics* (Oxford University Press)
- [36] Gasenzer T, Roberts D C and Burnett K 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* **65** 021605 (R)
- [37] Deb B, Agarwal G S 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* **65** 063618
- [38] Longhi S 2011 *J. Phys. B : At. Mol. Opt. Phys* **44** 051001
- [39] Gross C *et al.* 2011 *Nature* **480** 219-223