

Multipole vector solitons in nonlocal nonlinear media

Yaroslav V. Kartashov, Victor A. Vysloukh*, D. Mihalache** and Lluís Torner
*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fotoniques, Mediterranean Technology Park, and Universitat
Politecnica de Catalunya, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

We show that multipole solitons can be made stable via vectorial coupling in bulk nonlocal nonlinear media. Such vector solitons are composed of mutually incoherent nodeless and multipole components jointly inducing a nonlinear refractive index profile. We found that stabilization of the otherwise highly unstable multipoles occurs below a maximum energy flow. Such threshold is determined by the nonlocality degree.

OCIS codes: 190.5530, 190.4360, 060.1810

Nonlocality of the nonlinearity is a property exhibited by many nonlinear optical materials. For example, nonlocality may be important in nematic liquid crystals [1,2], thermal self-action [3], plasmas [4], or photorefractive materials [5]. Nonlocality suppresses modulational instability [6,7]; it stabilizes vortex [8] and two-dimensional fundamental solitons [9]. Since interactions of solitons in nonlocal media are determined by spatial separation, out-of-phase beams could form bound states, a feature predicted in [10] and observed in [11]. The maximum number of solitons that can be packed into stable bound state depends on the nature of nonlocal response [12]. Bound states of dark solitons were addressed in [13,14].

Two-dimensional bright solitons also form bound states in nonlocal media [5,15]. Recently, stable dipole solitons in a medium with Gaussian response function have been predicted [16]. However, many actual materials exhibit nonlocal responses with profiles that depart drastically from Gaussian one. In this Letter we address multipole solitons in a model with nonlocal response of Helmholtz type encountered, in particular, in nematic liquid crystals and plasmas, and show that the shape of nonlocal response is *crucial* for stability of two-dimensional bound states. Thus, *all* scalar bound states are found to be *unstable*, but they can be stabilized *via vectorial coupling* with nodeless soliton. Notice

that multipole vector solitons were also studied in the local saturable or photorefractive media [17-25].

We consider propagation of two mutually incoherent laser beams along the ξ axis in media with a nonlocal focusing nonlinearity described by the system of equations for light field amplitudes $q_{1,2}$ and nonlinear contribution to refractive index n :

$$\begin{aligned} i \frac{\partial q_{1,2}}{\partial \xi} &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \zeta^2} \right) q_{1,2} - q_{1,2} n, \\ n - d \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \zeta^2} \right) n &= |q_1|^2 + |q_2|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where η, ζ and ξ stand for the transverse and the longitudinal coordinates scaled to the beam width and diffraction length, respectively. The parameter $d > 0$ stands for the nonlocality degree of the nonlinear response. When $d \rightarrow 0$ Eqs. (1) reduce to Manakov vector nonlinear Schrödinger equations; the case $d \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to strongly nonlocal regime. Under proper conditions Eqs. (1) describe nonlocal nonlinearities of partially ionized plasmas resulting from many-body interactions [4] and orientational nonlinearity of nematic liquid crystals (see [1,2] for details of derivation). Eqs. (1) conserve the energy flow $U = U_1 + U_2 = \int \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (|q_1|^2 + |q_2|^2) d\eta d\zeta$. The nonlinear contribution to the refractive index is given by $n(\eta, \zeta) = \int \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} G(\eta - \lambda, \zeta - \tau) (|q_1(\lambda, \tau)|^2 + |q_2(\lambda, \tau)|^2) d\lambda d\tau$, where the response function $G(\eta, \zeta) = (2\pi d)^{-1} K_0[d^{-1/2}(\eta^2 + \zeta^2)^{1/2}]$ is expressed in terms of zero-order MacDonal function. Notice, that in contrast to Gaussian response function of Ref. [16], $G(\eta, \lambda)$ has a logarithmic singularity at $\eta^2 + \zeta^2 \rightarrow 0$ and decays slowly. From now on, we will refer to it as Helmholtz response function.

We searched for soliton solutions of Eqs. (1) numerically in the form $q_{1,2}(\eta, \zeta, \xi) = w_{1,2}(\eta, \zeta) \exp(ib_{1,2}\xi)$, where $w_{1,2}$ are real functions, and $b_{1,2}$ are propagation constants. The standard relaxation method was employed that allows to obtain soliton profiles with high accuracy (the difference between calculated profiles for subsequent iterations can be made less than 10^{-16}). In the scalar case ($w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$) we found a variety of solutions composed of several (or single) bright spots with opposite phases that are arranged in rings. Such multipole solitons exist in nonlocal media because the refractive index change in the overlap region between neighboring spots is determined by

the total intensity distribution in the entire transverse plane and under proper conditions equilibrium configurations of out-of-phase beams are possible. However, we found that all two-dimensional scalar multipole solitons corresponding to the Helmholtz response are unstable and only nodeless solitons can be stable, in contrast to findings reported in Ref. [16] for Gaussian nonlocal response.

Thus, a first central result of this Letter is that *the physical nature of the nonlocal response is crucial for stability of higher-order solutions in bulk geometries*. Second, we found that *vectorial coupling may lead to stabilization of the vector multipole solitons* even for realistic Helmholtz nonlocal response. Such multipole vector solitons with $w_1 w_2 \neq 0$ were found at $b_2 \leq b_1$ (further without loss of generality we set $b_1 = 3$ and vary b_2 and d). Profiles of simplest vector solitons are shown in Fig. 1. We do not depict here field w_1 of first nodeless component, but instead show the total refractive index profile n and modulus of multipole component w_2 . With growth of nonlocality degree d the width of refractive index distribution remarkably increases, so that for $d \gg 1$ it greatly exceeds the width of intensity distribution. The total energy flow is a monotonically growing function of propagation constant b_2 (Fig. 2(a)). At fixed b_1 and d there exist lower b_2^{low} and upper b_2^{upp} cutoffs, so that vector solitons can be found only for $b_2^{\text{low}} \leq b_2 \leq b_2^{\text{upp}}$. When $d \rightarrow 0$ one has $b_2^{\text{upp}} \rightarrow b_1$. With growth of nonlocality degree the width of existence domain for vector solitons shrinks (Figs 2(b) and 2(e)) At the upper cutoff w_1 vanishes and vector solitons transform into scalar multipoles; at the lower cutoff w_2 vanishes and one gets scalar nodeless soliton. This is illustrated in Fig. 2(d) showing energy sharing $S_{1,2} = U_{1,2}/U$ between dipole soliton components versus b_2 .

In quasi-local medium ($d \ll 1$) and $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{upp}}$ multipole vector solitons transform into several well-separated monopole vector solitons (the number of solitons is equal to the number of bright spots in w_2 field) with weak in-phase w_1 and strong out-of-phase w_2 components that are both nodeless. In this case the refractive index distribution features several well-separated peaks. When $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{low}}$ strong w_1 component remains well localized, while weak w_2 component remarkably broadens. In strongly nonlocal medium ($d \gg 1$) both w_1 and w_2 components are well localized in cutoffs. The refractive index distribution is bell-shaped at $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{low}}$, but at $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{upp}}$ small peaks whose positions coincide with position of intensity maxima in w_2 component are clearly observable in otherwise smooth and wide refractive index profile. Nodeless component

also features smooth bell-like shape at $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{low}}$ with maximum at $\eta, \zeta = 0$, while as $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{uPP}}$ secondary peaks gradually appear in the positions corresponding to intensity maxima in w_2 component. Notice, that the presence of peaks in refractive index, even in strongly nonlocal regime, is a specific feature of Helmholtz response in comparison with Gaussian response, where refractive index profile created by multipole beam can be bell-shaped in strongly nonlocal case.

The transformation of vector soliton into stable scalar nodeless beam at $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{low}}$ and unstable multipole beam at $b_2 \rightarrow b_2^{\text{uPP}}$ suggests the existence of stability domain for composite vector states near b_2^{low} . We found that vector solitons become stable when the energy flow carried by multipole component decreases below certain threshold, i.e., in the region $b_2^{\text{low}} \leq b_2 \leq b_2^{\text{cr}}$. The critical value b_2^{cr} increases monotonically with d (Fig. 2(c) and 2(f)). Notice that at $d \rightarrow 0$, the topological structure of the instability domain becomes complex, so that in some cases we determined b_2^{cr} only starting from certain minimal d value.

Propagation of perturbed multipole vector solitons is illustrated in Fig. 3. We solved Eqs. (1) by split-step Fourier method for input conditions $q_{1,2}|_{\xi=0} = w_{1,2}(1 + \rho_{1,2})$, where $\rho_{1,2}(\eta, \zeta)$ stand for white noise with the Gaussian distribution and variance σ_{noise}^2 . Stable multipole vector solitons retain their structure over indefinitely long distances even in the presence of considerable input noise (see Figs. 3(a) and 3(b)). Similar scenarios were encountered for higher-order vector solitons. Interestingly, the w_2 component of weakly unstable multipole solitons in the strongly nonlocal media may undergo noise-induced kaleidoscopic transformations, like those shown in Fig. 3(c), periodically almost restoring its input structure (thus, in Fig. 3(c) first restoration of input intensity distribution occurs at $\xi \approx 540$).

In conclusion, we have analyzed the existence and stability of multipole vector solitons in media with Helmholtz-type nonlocal nonlinear response. We revealed that in such media vectorial coupling with the nodeless beam is a necessary condition for stabilization of multipole solitons, which in the scalar case are highly unstable upon propagation. Our findings suggest that the physical nature, hence the spatial shape of nonlinear response function, is a crucial factor for stability of higher-order solitons.

*Also with Universidad de las Americas, Puebla, Mexico. **Also with National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest, Romania.

References with titles

1. M. Peccianti, K. A. Brzdakiewicz, and G. Assanto, “Nonlocal spatial soliton interactions in nematic liquid crystals”, *Opt. Lett.* **27**, 1460 (2002).
2. M. Peccianti, C. Conti, and G. Assanto, “Interplay between nonlocality and nonlinearity in nematic liquid crystals”, *Opt. Lett.* **30**, 415 (2005).
3. F. Derrien, J. F. Henninot, M. Warenghem, and G. Abbate, “A thermal (2D+1) spatial optical soliton in a dye doped liquid crystal,” *J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt.* **2**, 332 (2000).
4. A. G. Litvak, V. A. Mironov, G. M. Fraiman, and A. D. Yunakovskii, “Thermal self-effect of waves in plasma with a nonlocal nonlinearity”, *Sov. J. Plasma Phys.* **1**, 31 (1975).
5. A. V. Mamaev, A. A. Zozulya, V. K. Mezentsev, D. Z. Anderson, and M. Saffman, “Bound dipole solitary solutions in anisotropic nonlocal self-focusing media”, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, R1110 (1997).
6. W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, J. J. Rasmussen, and J. Wyller, “Modulational instability in nonlocal nonlinear Kerr media”, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 016612 (2001).
7. J. Wyller, W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, and J. J. Rasmussen, “Generic features of modulational instability in nonlocal Kerr media”, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 066615 (2002).
8. C. Rotschild, O. Cohen, O. Manela, M. Segev, and T. Carmon, “Solitons in nonlinear media with an infinite range of nonlocality: first observation of coherent elliptic solitons and of vortex-ring solitons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 213904 (2005).
9. W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, N. I. Nikolov, D. Neshev, J. Wyller, J. J. Rasmussen, and D. Edmundson, “Modulational instability, solitons and beam propagation in spatially nonlocal nonlinear media,” *J. Opt. B: Quantum and Semiclass. Opt.* **6**, S288 (2004).
10. I. A. Kolchugina, V. A. Mironov, and A. M. Sergeev, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **31**, 333 (1980). [*JETP Lett.* **31**, 304 (1980)].
11. X. Hutsebaut, C. Cambournac, M. Haelterman, A. Adamski, and K. Neyts, “Single-component higher-order mode solitons in liquid crystals” *Opt. Commun.* **233**, 211 (2004).

12. Z. Xu, Y. V. Kartashov, and L. Torner, “Upper threshold for stability of multipole-mode solitons in nonlocal nonlinear media,” *Opt. Lett.* **30**, 3171 (2005).
13. N. I. Nikolov, D. Neshev, W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, J. J. Rasmussen, and P. L. Christiansen, “Attraction of nonlocal dark optical solitons” *Opt. Lett.* **29**, 286 (2004).
14. A. Dreischuh, D. N. Neshev, D. E. Petersen, O. Bang, and W. Krolikowski, “Observation of attraction between dark solitons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 043901 (2006).
15. V. A. Mironov, A. M. Sergeev, and E. M. Sher, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **260**, 325 (1981) [*Sov. Phys. Dokl.* **26**, 861 (1981)].
16. S. Lopez-Aguayo, A. S. Desyatnikov, Y. S. Kivshar, S. Skupin, W. Krolikowski, and O. Bang, “Stable rotating dipole solitons in nonlocal optical media,” [arXiv.org, nlin.PS/0512053](https://arxiv.org/abs/nlin.PS/0512053) (2005).
17. M. Mitchell, M. Segev, and D. N. Christodoulides, “Observation of multihump multimode solitons”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4657 (1998).
18. E. A. Ostrovskaya, Y. S. Kivshar, D. V. Skryabin, and W. J. Firth, “Stability of multihump optical solitons”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 296 (1999).
19. J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, V. Perez-Garcia, E. A. Ostrovskaya, and Y. S. Kivshar, “Dipole-mode vector solitons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 82 (2000).
20. W. Krolikowski, E. A. Ostrovskaya, C. Weilnau, M. Geisser, G. McCarthy, Y. S. Kivshar, C. Denz, and B. Luther-Davies, “Observation of dipole-mode vector solitons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1424 (2000).
21. T. Carmon, C. Anastassiou, S. Lan, D. Kip, Z. H. Musslimani, M. Segev, and D. N. Christodoulides, “Observation of two-dimensional multimode solitons,” *Opt. Lett.* **25**, 1113 (2000).
22. A. Desyatnikov, D. Neshev, E. Ostrovskaya, Y. S. Kivshar, W. Krolikowski, B. Luther-Davies, J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, and V. Perez-Garcia, “Multipole spatial vector solitons,” *Opt. Lett.* **26**, 435 (2001).
23. D. Neshev, G. McCarthy, W. Krolikowski, E. A. Ostrovskaya, G. F. Calvo, F. Agullo-Lopez, and Y. S. Kivshar, “Dipole-mode vector solitons in anisotropic nonlocal self-focusing media,” *Opt. Lett.* **26**, 1185 (2001).

24. A. S. Desyatnikov, D. Neshev, E. A. Ostrovskaya, Y. S. Kivshar, G. McCarthy, W. Krolikowski, and B. Luther-Davies, “Multipole composite spatial solitons: theory and experiment,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **19**, 586 (2002).
25. J. Yang and D. E. Pelinovsky, “Stable vortex and dipole vector solitons in a saturable nonlinear medium,” *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 016608 (2003).

References without titles

1. M. Peccianti, K. A. Brzdakiewicz, and G. Assanto, *Opt. Lett.* **27**, 1460 (2002).
2. M. Peccianti, C. Conti, and G. Assanto, *Opt. Lett.* **30**, 415 (2005).
3. F. Derrien, J. F. Henninot, M. Warenghem, and G. Abbate, *J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt.* **2**, 332 (2000).
4. A. G. Litvak, V. A. Mironov, G. M. Fraiman, and A. D. Yunakovskii, *Sov. J. Plasma Phys.* **1**, 31 (1975).
5. A. V. Mamaev, A. A. Zozulya, V. K. Mezentsev, D. Z. Anderson, and M. Saffman, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, R1110 (1997).
6. W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, J. J. Rasmussen, and J. Wyller, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 016612 (2001).
7. J. Wyller, W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, and J. J. Rasmussen, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 066615 (2002).
8. C. Rotschild, O. Cohen, O. Manela, M. Segev, and T. Carmon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 213904 (2005).
9. W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, N. I. Nikolov, D. Neshev, J. Wyller, J. J. Rasmussen, and D. Edmundson, *J. Opt. B: Quantum and Semiclass. Opt.* **6**, S288 (2004).
10. I. A. Kolchugina, V. A. Mironov, and A. M. Sergeev, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **31**, 333 (1980). [*JETP Lett.* **31**, 304 (1980)].
11. X. Hutsebaut, C. Cambournac, M. Haelterman, A. Adamski, and K. Neyts, *Opt. Commun.* **233**, 211 (2004).
12. Z. Xu, Y. V. Kartashov, and L. Torner, *Opt. Lett.* **30**, 3171 (2005).
13. N. I. Nikolov, D. Neshev, W. Krolikowski, O. Bang, J. J. Rasmussen, and P. L. Christiansen, *Opt. Lett.* **29**, 286 (2004).
14. A. Dreischuh, D. N. Neshev, D. E. Petersen, O. Bang, and W. Krolikowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 043901 (2006).
15. V. A. Mironov, A. M. Sergeev, and E. M. Sher, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **260**, 325 (1981) [*Sov. Phys. Dokl.* **26**, 861 (1981)].
16. S. Lopez-Aguayo, A. S. Desyatnikov, Y. S. Kivshar, S. Skupin, W. Krolikowski, and O. Bang, *arXiv.org*, nlin.PS/0512053 (2005).

17. M. Mitchell, M. Segev, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4657 (1998).
18. E. A. Ostrovskaya, Y. S. Kivshar, D. V. Skryabin, and W. J. Firth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 296 (1999).
19. J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, V. Perez-Garcia, E. A. Ostrovskaya, and Y. S. Kivshar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 82 (2000).
20. W. Krolikowski, E. A. Ostrovskaya, C. Weilmann, M. Geisser, G. McCarthy, Y. S. Kivshar, C. Denz, and B. Luther-Davies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1424 (2000).
21. T. Carmon, C. Anastassiou, S. Lan, D. Kip, Z. H. Musslimani, M. Segev, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Opt. Lett.* **25**, 1113 (2000).
22. A. Desyatnikov, D. Neshev, E. Ostrovskaya, Y. S. Kivshar, W. Krolikowski, B. Luther-Davies, J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, and V. Perez-Garcia, *Opt. Lett.* **26**, 435 (2001).
23. D. Neshev, G. McCarthy, W. Krolikowski, E. A. Ostrovskaya, G. F. Calvo, F. Agullo-Lopez, and Y. S. Kivshar, *Opt. Lett.* **26**, 1185 (2001).
24. A. S. Desyatnikov, D. Neshev, E. A. Ostrovskaya, Y. S. Kivshar, G. McCarthy, W. Krolikowski, and B. Luther-Davies, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **19**, 586 (2002).
25. J. Yang and D. E. Pelinovsky, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 016608 (2003).

Figure captions

- Figure 1. Total refractive index profile (left column) and field modulus distribution in second component (right column) for (a) dipole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 1.8$, and $d = 3$, (b) quadrupole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.9$, and $d = 4$, (c) hexapole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.4$, and $d = 5$.
- Figure 2. (a) Energy flow of dipole soliton vs propagation constant b_2 at $d = 1$ (1) and 0.2 (2). (b) Domain of existence of dipole solitons on the plane (d, b_2) . (c) Critical propagation constant vs nonlocality degree for dipole solitons. (d) Energy sharing between components of dipole soliton vs propagation constant b_2 . (e) Domain of existence of quadrupole solitons on the plane (d, b_2) . (f) Critical propagation constant vs nonlocality degree for quadrupole solitons. In all cases $b_1 = 3$.
- Figure 3. Propagation dynamics of vector solitons in the presence of white input noise with variance $\sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 = 0.01$. (a) Dipole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 1.8$, and $d = 3$. (b) Quadrupole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.9$, and $d = 4$. (c) Hexapole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.4$, and $d = 5$. Only intensity distributions in second components are shown at different distances.




Figure 1. Total refractive index profile (left column) and field modulus distribution in second component (right column) for (a) dipole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 1.8$, and $d = 3$, (b) quadrupole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.9$, and $d = 4$, (c) hexapole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.4$, and $d = 5$.




Figure 2. (a) Energy flow of dipole soliton vs propagation constant b_2 at $d = 1$ (1) and 0.2 (2). (b) Domain of existence of dipole solitons on the plane (d, b_2) . (c) Critical propagation constant vs nonlocality degree for dipole solitons. (d) Energy sharing between components of dipole soliton vs propagation constant b_2 . (e) Domain of existence of quadrupole solitons on the plane (d, b_2) . (f) Critical propagation constant vs nonlocality degree for quadrupole solitons. In all cases $b_1 = 3$.




Figure 3. Propagation dynamics of vector solitons in the presence of white input noise with variance $\sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 = 0.01$. (a) Dipole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 1.8$, and $d = 3$. (b) Quadrupole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.9$, and $d = 4$. (c) Hexapole soliton at $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 0.4$, and $d = 5$. Only intensity distributions in second components are shown at different distances.