

Dynamic Stability of The Time-averaged Orbiting Potential Trap: Exact Classical Analysis.

S. Gov¹ and S. Shtrikman²
The Department of Electronics,
Weizmann Institute of Science,
Rehovot 76100, Israel

September 18, 2018

¹Also with the Center for Technological Education Holon, 52 Golomb St., P.O.B 305, Holon 58102, Israel.

²Also with the Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, 92093 CA, USA.

Abstract

We calculate *exactly* the modes of motion of the Time-averaged Orbiting Potential (TOP) trap with its four degrees of freedom, namely the three translations and the spin, taken into account. We find that, when gravity is neglected, there are *two* parameters in the problem namely, the angular velocity of the rotating field and its strength. We present the stability diagram in these parameters. We find the mode frequencies calculated from the time-averaged potential model used by the inventors of the TOP is an excellent approximation to our exact results. However, for other parameters, this may not be the case.

1 Introduction.

The first observation of Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) [1] was done in the so-called Time-averaged Orbiting Potential (TOP) trap. Although later other magnetic traps, optical plug, and even an all-optical one[2] were used, the ingenious TOP trap continues to be a workhorse in the trade[3] because of its unique advantage as pointed out by [4]. It seemed to us thus worthwhile to extend the analysis given in Ref.[4], which is based on the concept of a time-averaged adiabatic potential, by studying the *exact* motion of all the degrees of freedom in the problem, namely the three translational degrees of freedom and the spin degree of freedom of the particle[5]. This has the advantage of allowing the calculation of limitations required by stability. We find that, when gravity g is neglected, there are *two* parameters in the problem, the angular velocity of the rotating field Ω and its strength α , and we present the stability diagram in the α - Ω plane. The parameters reported in Ref.[4] are shown to be well inside the stable region. Their calculated frequencies agree excellently with our exact frequencies for their experiment. When the limit of high field strength is taken, our analytic results reduce to their formulae. The stability diagram that we found shows that the TOP trap is very flexible for the experimentalist in terms of allowed parameters α and Ω . Our treatment is classical, but we also discuss what is involved in a quantum-mechanical calculation.

The structure of this paper is as follows: In Sec.2 we first define the problem, write down the equations of motion and find stationary solutions of these equations. Next, we perturb the stationary solutions, linearize the equations of motion and derive the secular equation which determines the frequencies of the various possible modes. The secular equation is given as a function of α , Ω and g . In Sec.3 we use the secular equation to find the mode frequencies for the TOP trap described in Ref.[4], and compare our exact results with their calculations and measurements. In Sec.4 we specify to the case $g = 0$ and derive approximate expressions for the mode frequencies in the limit where α is large, starting from the secular equation. These are found to agree with the corresponding expressions given in Ref.[4]. In Sec.5 we present the stability region in the α - Ω plane (for $g = 0$) for which stable trapping occurs, and comment on its implications and limitations. Finally, in Sec.7 we summarize our results and discuss briefly the related quantum-mechanical problem.

2 Derivation of secular equation.

2.1 Mathematical formulation and physical interpretation.

We consider a particle of mass m , intrinsic spin $\mathbf{S} = S\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ and magnetic moment $\mu = -\mu\hat{\mathbf{n}}$, moving in 3D space in the presence of uniform gravitation $-G\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and an inhomogeneous time-dependent magnetic field given by

$$\mathbf{H} = H' \left(-\frac{1}{2}\rho\hat{\rho} + h\hat{\mathbf{z}} \right) + H (\cos(\varphi - \Omega_r t) \hat{\rho} - \sin(\varphi - \Omega_r t) \hat{\varphi}). \quad (1)$$

Here, (h, ρ, φ) are the height, radial distance and polar angle of the center of mass of the particle in cylindrical coordinate system, $(\hat{\mathbf{z}}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\varphi})$ are the corresponding unit vectors, H is the strength of the (uniform) time-dependent field rotating at an angular velocity Ω_r about the z -axis, and H' is the time-independent field gradient in the z -direction.

The equations of motion for the center of mass of the particle $\mathbf{r} = z\hat{\mathbf{z}} + \rho\hat{\rho}$ are

$$m \frac{d^2 \mathbf{r}}{dt^2} = -\mu \nabla (\hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{H}) - mG\hat{\mathbf{z}}, \quad (2)$$

and the evolution of its spin is determined by

$$S \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{n}}}{dt} = -\mu \hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \mathbf{H}. \quad (3)$$

In the following, it is convenient to express $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ - a unit vector in the direction of the spin, in terms of its components along the $(\hat{\mathbf{z}}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\varphi})$ directions. We denote these by n_z , n_ρ and n_φ , respectively. Note however, that the unit vectors $(\hat{\rho}, \hat{\varphi})$ themselves depend on time according to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\rho}}{dt} &= \frac{d\varphi}{dt} \hat{\varphi}, \\ \frac{d\hat{\varphi}}{dt} &= -\frac{d\varphi}{dt} \hat{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Substitution of Eq.(1) into Eqs.(2) and (3), and making use of Eq.(4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2\rho}{dt^2} - \rho \left(\frac{d\varphi}{dt} \right)^2 &= \frac{\mu H'}{2m} n_\rho \\
2 \frac{d\rho}{dt} \frac{d\varphi}{dt} + \rho \frac{d^2\varphi}{dt^2} &= \frac{\mu H'}{2m} n_\varphi \\
\frac{d^2h}{dt^2} &= -\frac{\mu H'}{m} n_z - G \\
\frac{dn_\rho}{dt} - \frac{d\varphi}{dt} n_\varphi &= -\frac{\mu}{S} [H'h n_\varphi + H n_z \sin(\varphi - \Omega_r t)] \\
\frac{dn_\varphi}{dt} + \frac{d\varphi}{dt} n_\rho &= -\frac{\mu}{S} \left[H n_z \cos(\varphi - \Omega_r t) - \frac{1}{2} \rho n_z H' - n_\rho H' h \right] \\
\frac{dn_z}{dt} &= -\frac{\mu}{S} \left[-n_\varphi H \cos(\varphi - \Omega_r t) + \frac{1}{2} \rho n_\varphi H' - n_\rho H \sin(\varphi - \Omega_r t) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Eqs.(5) are almost the equations of motion of the particle in a coordinate system which is rotating with the field. The only difference is in the definition of the angle φ , which is measured with respect to the *fixed* $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ axis rather than with respect to the axis defined by the rotating field. To show this we rewrite the equations of motion in the rotating frame by substituting

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{r} &\rightarrow \mathbf{r}, \\
\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} &\rightarrow \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} + \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{r}, \\
\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}}{dt^2} &\rightarrow \frac{d^2\mathbf{r}}{dt^2} + 2\Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} + \Omega_r^2 \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times (\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{r}), \\
\left(\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{n}}}{dt} \right) &\rightarrow \left(\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{n}}}{dt} \right) + \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \hat{\mathbf{n}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

This brings the equations of motion Eq.(2) and (3) into

$$m \left[\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}}{dt^2} + 2\Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} + \Omega_r^2 \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times (\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{r}) \right] = -\mu \nabla \left[\hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \left(\mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu} \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \right) \right] - mG \hat{\mathbf{z}} \tag{7}$$

and

$$S \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{n}}}{dt} = -\mu \hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \left[\mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu} \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \right], \tag{8}$$

where now the magnetic field \mathbf{H} is *time-independent* and is given by

$$\mathbf{H} = H' \left(-\frac{1}{2} \rho \hat{\rho} + h \hat{\mathbf{z}} \right) + H \hat{\mathbf{x}}. \tag{9}$$

Eqs.(7) and (8) indicate that in the comoving frame, the particle is acted upon by an additional uniform magnetic field $-(S\Omega_r/\mu)\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, a centrifugal force $-m\Omega_r^2\hat{\mathbf{z}}\times(\hat{\mathbf{z}}\times\mathbf{r})$ and a velocity-dependent Coriolis force $m\mathbf{v}\times(2\Omega_r\hat{\mathbf{z}})$. The action of the Coriolis force may also be interpreted as the Lorentz force of the inertial field $\sim\Omega_r\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ which acts on the mass of the particle. Finally, rewriting Eqs.(7) and (8) in polar coordinates yields Eqs.(5) with $\varphi - \Omega_r t$ replaced by φ .

As the number of parameters in the problem is relatively large, we rewrite the equations of motion in terms of normalized coordinates. We thus define

$$R_0 \equiv \left(\frac{S^2}{\mu m H'} \right)^{1/3}$$

as the characteristic length-scale in the problem, and

$$\Omega_0 \equiv \left(\frac{(\mu H')^2}{m S} \right)^{1/3}$$

as the characteristic angular velocity. This allows to define the dimensionless quantities

$$\begin{aligned} r &\equiv \rho/R_0 \\ z &\equiv h/R_0 \\ \tau &\equiv \Omega_0 t \\ g &\equiv G/(\Omega_0^2 R_0) \\ \Omega &\equiv \Omega_r/\Omega_0 \\ \alpha &\equiv \mu H/S\Omega_0, \end{aligned}$$

with which Eqs.(5) become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 r}{d\tau^2} - r \left(\frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{2} n_\rho \\ 2 \frac{dr}{d\tau} \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} + r \frac{d^2 \varphi}{d\tau^2} &= \frac{1}{2} n_\varphi \\ \frac{d^2 z}{d\tau^2} &= -n_z - g \\ \frac{dn_\rho}{d\tau} - \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} n_\varphi &= -z n_\varphi - \alpha n_z \sin(\varphi - \Omega\tau) \\ \frac{dn_\varphi}{d\tau} + \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} n_\rho &= -\alpha n_z \cos(\varphi - \Omega\tau) + \frac{1}{2} r n_z + n_\rho z \\ \frac{dn_z}{d\tau} &= n_\varphi \alpha \cos(\varphi - \Omega\tau) - \frac{1}{2} r n_\varphi + n_\rho \alpha \sin(\varphi - \Omega\tau). \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

In this form, one is left with only *three* parameters

- α -the normalized strength of the rotating field,
- Ω -the normalized angular speed of the rotating field, and
- g -the normalized free-fall acceleration.

2.2 The stationary solutions and their stability.

We seek a solution in which the particle moves synchronously with the field at a constant radius and height. Setting

$$\varphi = \varphi_0 + \Omega\tau \quad ; \quad r(\tau) = r_0 \quad ; \quad z(\tau) = z_0$$

in Eqs.(10) we find *two* possible solutions, given by

$$\begin{aligned} n_\rho &= -2\Omega^2 r_0 \\ n_\varphi &= 0 \\ n_z &= -g \\ \varphi_0 &= 90^\circ \pm 90^\circ \\ z_0 &= \Omega - \frac{g}{2\Omega^2 r_0} \left(\frac{1}{2}r_0 \pm \alpha \right). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The value of r_0 is determined by the condition that $|\hat{\mathbf{n}}| = \sqrt{n_\rho^2 + n_\varphi^2 + n_z^2} = 1$, giving

$$r_0 = \frac{\sqrt{1 - g^2}}{2\Omega^2}. \tag{12}$$

It can be easily shown that the stationary solution corresponding to $\varphi_0 = 180^\circ$ has its magnetic moment *antiparallel* to the direction of the local magnetic field, whereas for the $\varphi_0 = 0^\circ$ solution it is *parallel* to the direction of the field. From Eq.(12) we also conclude that for a stationary solution to exist, $|g|$ must be smaller than 1. This is simply a consequence of the fact that, in our model, the magnetic field cannot apply a force greater than $\mu H'$ in the $+z$ -direction. When the weight of the particle mG is greater than $\mu H'$, the magnetic force cannot balance the weight of the particle. The latter then accelerates in the axial direction, and no stationary solution exists. Note also that the particle is located *above* the origin with its spin pointing

inward, even in the *absence* of gravity [6]. This is necessary in order to have a z -component of the field. The latter exerts torque on the spin that causes it to rotate synchronously with the field.

To check the stability of the solutions found, we add first-order perturbations. We set

$$\begin{aligned}
r(\tau) &= r_0 + \delta r \\
\varphi &= \Omega\tau + 90^\circ \pm 90^\circ + \delta\varphi \\
z(\tau) &= \left[\Omega - \frac{g}{2\Omega^2 r_0} \left(\frac{1}{2}r_0 \pm \alpha \right) \right] + \delta z \\
n_\rho &= -2\Omega^2 r_0 + \delta n_\rho \\
n_\varphi &= 0 + \delta n_\varphi \\
n_z &= -g + \delta n_z,
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

substitute these into Eqs.(10), and retain only first-order terms. We find that the resulting equations for the perturbations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2 \delta r}{d\tau^2} - 2\Omega r_0 \frac{d\delta\varphi}{d\tau} - \delta r \Omega^2 &= -\frac{g}{4\Omega^2 r_0} \delta n_z \\
2\Omega \frac{d\delta r}{d\tau} + r_0 \frac{d^2 \delta\varphi}{d\tau^2} &= \frac{1}{2} \delta n_\varphi \\
\frac{d^2 \delta z}{d\tau^2} &= -\delta n_z \\
\frac{d\delta n_\rho}{d\tau} &= \frac{g}{2\Omega^2 r_0} \left(\frac{1}{2}r_0 \pm \alpha \right) \delta n_\varphi \mp \alpha g \delta\varphi \\
\frac{d\delta n_\varphi}{d\tau} - 2\Omega^2 r_0 \frac{d\delta\varphi}{d\tau} &= -\frac{1}{2}g\delta r - 2\Omega^2 r_0 \delta z + \frac{(\frac{1}{2}r_0 \pm \alpha)}{4\Omega^4 r_0^2} \delta n_z.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In deriving these equations we used the constraint

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \delta \hat{\mathbf{n}} = 2\Omega^2 r_0 \delta n_\rho + g \delta n_z = 0, \tag{15}$$

since $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is, by definition, a unit vector. We have also discarded in Eqs.(14) the equation corresponding to the *last* equation in Eqs.(10) as it turned out to be identical to the fourth.

Looking back at Eqs.(14) we note that the two possible solutions differ by the *sign* of α (reversal of the *direction* of the rotating field). It is therefore suffices to concentrate on the solution with $\varphi_0 = 180^\circ$ for example, and to study both *positive* and *negative* values of α . This is what we do in the following.

To look for oscillatory (stable) solutions for Eqs.(14) we set

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta r &= (\delta r)_0 e^{-i\omega t} \\
\delta \varphi &= (\delta \varphi)_0 e^{-i\omega t} \\
\delta z &= (\delta z)_0 e^{-i\omega t} \\
\delta n_z &= (\delta n_z)_0 e^{-i\omega t} \\
\delta n_\varphi &= (\delta n_\varphi)_0 e^{-i\omega t}
\end{aligned}$$

inside Eqs.(14) and get

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \omega^2 + \Omega^2 & -2i\omega\Omega r_0 & 0 & -\frac{g}{4\Omega^2 r_0} & 0 \\ -2i\omega\Omega & -r_0\omega^2 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\alpha g & 0 & -\frac{i\omega g}{2\Omega^2 r_0} & \frac{g(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}r_0)}{2\Omega^2 r_0} \\ \frac{1}{2}g & 2i\omega\Omega^2 r_0 & 2\Omega^2 r_0 & -\frac{(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}r_0)}{4\Omega^4 r_0^2} & -i\omega \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} (\delta r)_0 \\ (\delta \varphi)_0 \\ (\delta z)_0 \\ (\delta n_z)_0 \\ (\delta n_\varphi)_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

This equation has non-trivial solutions whenever the determinant of the matrix \mathbf{A} vanishes. Thus, the equation

$$16r_0\Omega^4 \det \mathbf{A} = A_4\omega^8 + A_3\omega^6 + A_2\omega^4 + A_1\omega^2 + A_0 = 0, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0 &= -32\Omega^{10}\alpha r_0^3 \\
A_1 &= +48\Omega^8 r_0^4 + 4\Omega^4\alpha^2 + 64\alpha\Omega^8 r_0^3 \\
&\quad + 2\Omega^4\alpha r_0 - 2g^2 r_0\Omega^4\alpha \\
A_2 &= -16\Omega^6 r_0^4 - 8\alpha^2\Omega^2 - 3\Omega^2 r_0^2 \\
&\quad - 16\Omega^8 r_0^2 - 32\Omega^6 r_0^3\alpha - 10\alpha\Omega^2 r_0 \\
&\quad - 16\Omega^5 g r_0^2 - 2g^2 r_0\Omega^2\alpha - g^2 r_0^2\Omega^2 \\
A_3 &= 4\alpha^2 + r_0^2 + 4\alpha r_0 + 32\Omega^6 r_0^2 \\
A_4 &= -16\Omega^4 r_0^2,
\end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

determines the eigenfrequencies ω of the various possible modes.

At this point we pause and prove that the solution with $\varphi_0 = 0^0$ is *not* stable for *any* combination of α , Ω and g : We consider the fourth order polynomial Eq.(17) as a polynomial in $x = \omega^2$. We note that when $x = 0$, the polynomial takes on the value $A_0 = -32\Omega^{10}\alpha r_0^3$ which is *positive* when α is negative. When $x \rightarrow -\infty$ on the other hand, it takes on a value which is asymptotic to $A_4x^4 = -16\Omega^4r_0^2x^4$ which, for sufficiently large (negative) x , gives a *negative* value. Thus, at least one root $x = \omega^2$ of the polynomial must be *negative*, corresponding to two purely *imaginary* frequencies with opposite signs, and hence to an *unstable* solution.

3 Analysis of the TOP trap of Ref.[4].

We now put Eq.(17) to use by calculating the mode frequencies of the TOP trap described in Ref.[4]. The parameters in this trap were: $H = 10^{-3}Tesla$, $G \simeq 10m/sec^2$, $H' = 2.4Tesla/meter$, $m \simeq (A_{Rb}/A_H)m_{proton} = 1.416 \cdot 10^{-25}[Kg]$ (where A_{Rb} is the atomic mass of Rubidium, A_H is the atomic mass of Hydrogen and m_p is the mass of proton), $f_{rotation} = 7.5KHz$, $\mu = \mu_B/2 = 4.6 \cdot 10^{-24}Joule/Tesla$ and $S = \hbar = 1 \cdot 10^{-34}Joule \cdot sec$. From these parameters we find that $\Omega_0 = 2.049 \cdot 10^4rad/sec$, $R_0 = 1.856 \cdot 10^{-7}meter$, $\alpha = 2.245 \cdot 10^3$, $g = 0.1283$, $\Omega = 2.3$, $r_0 = 0.0937$, $z_0 = -288$, $n_\rho = -0.99$, $n_z = -0.1283$ and $n_\varphi = 0$. These correspond to a particle orbiting at a radius of $\rho_0 = 17.4nm$ and height $z_0 = 53.5\mu m$ above the origin. The magnetic field at that point is about $-(\hat{\rho}-0.128\hat{z}) \cdot 10^{-3}Tesla$, and is therefore dominated by the strength of the rotating field.

Solving for the four roots ω of the characteristic polynomial Eq.(17) and multiplying the ω 's by $\Omega_0/2\pi$ gives the frequencies: $7.38MHz$, $7.524441522KHz$, $7.475558498KHz$ and $67.99Hz$. The highest frequency $7.38MHz$ correspond to the precessional mode of motion. Its frequency is very close to the value $\mu H_s/2\pi S$ where H_s is the strength of the local magnetic field at the stationary point. As was calculated above, H_s is roughly equal to the strength of the rotating field H . The two middle frequencies $\sim 7.5KHz$ turn out to be very close to the frequency of rotation of the field $7.5KHz$. The reason that we keep so many digits in these frequencies will be clarified shortly. Calculation of the eigenvectors for these two modes yields $(\delta r)_0/(\delta z)_0 \sim 1.9 \cdot 10^5 \gg 1$ for both, which shows that their coupling to the axial coordinate is small, indicating that these are the two *lateral* vibrational modes. Recall that the frequencies that are found here correspond

to the *rotating* frame. To find the frequencies in the *laboratory* frame we explicitly calculate the time dependence of the lateral coordinates: The x coordinate for example, is given by $x(\tau) = (r_0 + \delta r) \cos [180^\circ + \Omega\tau + \delta\varphi]$ where $\delta r = (\delta r)_0 \cos(\omega\tau)$, $\delta\varphi = (\delta\varphi)_0 \cos(\omega\tau + \phi_0)$ and ϕ_0 is a phase which is determined by the eigenvectors. Expansion of $x(\tau)$ to first order in the perturbations shows that it contains a term proportional to the product $\cos [180^\circ + \Omega\tau + \delta\varphi] \cos(\omega\tau + \phi_0)$ which contains a term with *slow* frequency $\omega - \Omega$ and another term with *fast* frequency $\omega + \Omega$ with the *same* amplitude. We thus find that, in the laboratory frame, the frequencies of the *axial* vibrational modes are given by subtracting and adding the rotation frequency from the middle frequencies found by using Eq.(17). This gives the two *slow* lateral frequencies $+24.441522Hz$ and $-24.441502Hz$, and the *fast* lateral frequencies $15.0244KHz$ and $14.9756KHz$. The eigenvector for the lowest frequency $67.99Hz$ satisfy $(\delta r)_0 / (\delta z)_0 \sim 5 \cdot 10^{-6} \ll 1$, which is a clear indication that this is the *axial* vibrational mode. In this case, the frequency of vibration is the same both for the rotating frame and the laboratory frame so no subtraction/addition of Ω is needed.

Table I compares our results to the measured and calculated results reported in [4]. We conclude that the Time-averaged Orbiting Potential (TOP) approximation is indeed a *very* good approximation to the exact result obtained here. Note however, that the two *fast* lateral frequencies $\omega + \Omega$ that our analysis yield, were not reported in Ref.[4], possibly because they were not looked for.

Note also that in the time-averaged orbiting potential approximation, the resulting potential is necessarily isotropic in the lateral plane. Hence, in this approximation there is only *one* lateral vibrational frequency. The exact analysis presented here, on the other hand, gives naturally *two* frequencies, corresponding to the two *slow* lateral vibrational modes, and *two* more frequencies, corresponding to the *fast* lateral modes. For the TOP trap parameters given above we find the *slow* frequencies to be *very* nearly equal, up to the seventh significant digit. The splitting is a consequence of the fact that the clock-wise lateral vibrational mode is not equivalent to the counter clock-wise lateral vibrational mode since in both cases the spin precesses in the *same* direction. This splitting may be *large* for other choice for the parameters.

4 Approximate expressions for the mode frequencies.

For the numerical example of the previous section we have found that $g \ll 1$, $\alpha \gg 1$ and $\Omega \sim 1$. These relations hold also for more recent TOP traps [7, 8], and it is therefore natural to find approximate expressions for the mode frequencies under these limits. We expect that for these values, the four frequencies will be as follows: A very high frequency ω_p corresponding to the precession, two very close middle frequencies ω_{xy} which are almost equal to Ω and correspond to the lateral vibrations, and a very low frequency ω_z corresponding to the axial vibrations. The large dynamic range spanned by these frequencies suggests that there is a certain relation between the coefficients of the polynomial in the secular equation Eq.(17). We exploit this relation in order to find approximate expressions for the mode frequencies: We first construct a fourth-order polynomial in ω^2 , whose roots ω_p^2 , ω_{xy}^2 and ω_z^2 satisfy the relations $\omega_p^2 \gg \omega_{xy}^2 \gg \omega_z^2$, expand it in powers of ω^2 , and keep only *dominant* terms in the coefficients. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} & (\omega^2 - \omega_p^2) (\omega^2 - \omega_{xy}^2)^2 (\omega^2 - \omega_z^2) \\ & \simeq \omega^8 - (\omega_p^2) \omega^6 + (2\omega_p^2 \omega_{xy}^2) \omega^4 - (\omega_p^2 \omega_{xy}^4) \omega^2 + \omega_p^2 \omega_{xy}^4 \omega_z^2. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Comparing this with Eq.(17) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_p^2 & \simeq \lim_{g=0, \alpha \gg 1} \left(-\frac{A_3}{A_4} \right) = \alpha^2 \\ \omega_{xy}^2 & \simeq \lim_{g=0, \alpha \gg 1} \left(-\frac{A_2}{2A_3} \right) = \Omega^2 \\ \omega_z^2 & \simeq \lim_{g=0, \alpha \gg 1} \left(-\frac{A_0}{A_1} \right) = \frac{1}{\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Clearly, this approximation is not sufficient to determine the difference of the frequencies of the *lateral* vibrational modes. To furnish *these* differences, we substitute $\omega^2 \rightarrow \Omega^2 + d$ into Eq.(17) and expand to *second* order in d . The result is

$$d^2 \sum_{n=0}^4 \frac{n(n-1)}{2} A_n (\Omega^2)^{n-1} + d \sum_{n=0}^4 n A_n (\Omega^2)^{n-1} + \sum_{n=0}^4 A_n (\Omega^2)^n = 0. \quad (21)$$

Setting $g = 0$ and solving for d gives

$$d = \pm \frac{\Omega}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-1}), \quad (22)$$

corresponding to the *slow* laboratory-frame frequencies

$$(\omega_{xy})_{lab} = \sqrt{\Omega^2 + d} - \Omega = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-3/2}). \quad (23)$$

In particular we find that

$$\frac{\omega_z}{(\omega_{xy})_{lab}} = \pm \sqrt{8} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-1/2}), \quad (24)$$

which shows that our analysis reduces to the results reported in Ref.[4].

In non-normalized units the mode frequencies in the laboratory-frame are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{prec.} &\simeq \frac{\mu H}{S} \\ \omega_z \Omega_0 &\simeq \pm \sqrt{\frac{\mu H'^2}{8mH}} \\ (\omega_{xy})_{lab} \Omega_0 &\simeq \sqrt{\frac{\mu H'^2}{mH}}. \end{aligned}$$

5 The stability region for $g = 0$.

Having analyzed the TOP trap for the limit $\alpha \gg 1$, we turn our attention to study the region $\alpha, \Omega \sim 1$, which has not yet been exploited experimentally. To keep matters simple, we specify to the gravitation-free case $g = 0$. We use Eq.(17) to scan the α - Ω plane in the search of points corresponding to stable solutions. The result is shown in Fig.(8).

This figure shows the *boundary* lines between points corresponding to stable regions and unstable regions. The fact that these lines consist of different segments, indicate that two different segments of a given line correspond to *different* modes that become unstable. For example, going upward along the $\alpha = 2.5$ line, we find that the two *slowest* modes coalesce and become unstable at $\Omega \simeq 0.73$. As Ω is increased, these modes become stable again at $\Omega \simeq 0.91$. When Ω is further increased, the two *fastest* modes become

unstable at $\Omega \simeq 1.72$. Note that we have found a small stability region in the range $\Omega \simeq 1.2-2$ and $\alpha \simeq 0-0.05$, which we did not investigate in detail.

As $A_0 \propto \Omega^{10}\alpha$ we conclude that points, both along the $\Omega = 0$ line and along the $\alpha = 0$ line, have one mode with vanishing frequency, corresponding to a soft mode. In addition, all points in the $\alpha < 0$ half-plane correspond to unstable solutions, as was proved earlier. Note also that the coefficients in the secular equation really depend on Ω^2 and not just on Ω . Hence, the continuation of the stability diagram to the $\Omega < 0$ half-plane is simply a mirror reflection of the $\Omega > 0$ half-plane with respect to the $\Omega = 0$ line.

The stability diagram shows that the TOP trap is much more tolerant than what one would have expected. There are many points near the corner of the first quadrant of the α - Ω plane that may be used experimentally. Note however that as $r_0 \sim 1/\Omega^2$, the use of too low a value for Ω results in a large radius. This radius may fall outside the region in which our linear approximation to the spatial dependence of the field holds. The lower bound on Ω is therefore determined by the *second* derivative of the field. In addition, quantum-mechanical considerations set a lower bound on α as well. It can be shown that the extent of the wavefunction of the particle $\Delta x_{\text{quantum}} \sim \sqrt{\hbar/m\omega}$, and the extent of the field $\Delta x_{\text{field}} \sim H/H'$ scale as $\Delta x_{\text{quantum}}/\Delta x_{\text{field}} \sim \alpha^{-3/4}$. Thus, in order to keep the extent of the wavefunction much smaller than the extent of the field, α too must be kept large enough.

6 Connection with the adiabatic approximation.

It is instructive to study the same problem in the limit where the system is *extremely* adiabatic. For simplicity we specify to the case $G = 0$. In this approximation, the direction of the spin $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is *locked* to the direction of the *local* magnetic field, so that

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}} \simeq \frac{\mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu} \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}}}{\left| \mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu} \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \right|}. \quad (25)$$

Substitution of Eq.(25) into Eq.(7) and discarding the equation for the spin Eq.(8) gives

$$m \left[\frac{d^2 \mathbf{r}}{dt^2} + 2\Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} + \Omega_r^2 \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times (\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{r}) \right] = -\mu \nabla \left| \mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu} \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \right|, \quad (26)$$

with \mathbf{H} given by Eq.(9).

It is important to note that this approximation is *different* from the time-averaged orbiting potential (TOP) approximation. In the latter, one constructs a time-dependent potential $V_{TOP}(\mathbf{r}, t) \propto |\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{r}, t)|$, then averages $V_{TOP}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ over time to get a time-*independent* potential $V_{TOP}^0(\mathbf{r})$. Here, we work in the *rotating* frame, in which $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{r})$ is time-*independent*, and construct a time-independent potential

$$V_{AD}(\mathbf{r}) \propto \left| \mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu} \Omega_r \hat{\mathbf{z}} \right|.$$

Normalizing the Cartesian components of the position vector $\mathbf{r} = x\hat{\mathbf{x}} + y\hat{\mathbf{y}} + z\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ to R_0 , we find that a stationary solution to Eq.(26) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &= -\frac{1}{2\Omega^2} \\ y_0 &= 0 \\ z_0 &= \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

This result agrees with Eqs.(11) and (12) for the case $g = 0$. The other possible solution, in which x_0 is *positive*, is discarded because it is not stable.

Substituting

$$\begin{aligned} x &= x_0 + \delta x \\ y &= y_0 + \delta y \\ z &= z_0 + \delta z \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

into the normalized form of Eq.(26), and expanding to first order in the perturbations gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \delta x}{dt^2} - 2\Omega \frac{d\delta y}{dt} - \Omega^2 \delta x &= 0 \\ \frac{d^2 \delta y}{dt^2} + 2\Omega \frac{d\delta x}{dt} - \Omega^2 \delta y &= -\frac{\Omega^2}{4\Omega^2 \alpha + 1} \delta y \\ \frac{d^2 \delta z}{dt^2} &= -\frac{4\Omega^2}{4\Omega^2 \alpha + 1} \delta z. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We therefore find that the axial translational degree of freedom is decoupled from the rest, with a frequency

$$\omega_z = \frac{2\Omega}{\sqrt{4\Omega^2\alpha + 1}} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + O(\alpha^{-3/2}) ,$$

which agrees with Eq.(20). For the lateral translational degrees of freedom we have

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} -\omega^2 - \Omega^2 & 2i\omega\Omega \\ -2i\omega\Omega & -\omega^2 - \Omega^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{4\Omega^2\alpha + 1} \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \delta x \\ \delta y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} ,$$

for which a non-trivial solution exists whenever

$$(4\Omega^2\alpha + 1) \det \mathbf{M} = (4\Omega^2\alpha + 1) \omega^4 - (8\Omega^4\alpha + 3\Omega^2) \omega^2 + 4\Omega^6\alpha = 0.$$

This equation furnishes the frequencies

$$\omega_{xy}^2 = \frac{8\Omega^4\alpha + 3\Omega^2 \pm \Omega^2 \sqrt{32\Omega^2\alpha + 9}}{2(4\Omega^2\alpha + 1)} ,$$

corresponding to the laboratory-frame frequencies

$$(\omega_{xy})_{lab} = \omega_{xy} - \Omega = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-3/2}) .$$

This result also agrees with Eq.(23).

Though in this model the spin is locked to the direction of the field, we can nevertheless define a precessional frequency ω_p by calculating the field *at the stationary point* H_s and define $\omega_p\Omega_0 \equiv \mu H_s/S$. This gives

$$\omega_p = \alpha + \frac{1}{4\Omega^2} ,$$

which for $\alpha\Omega^2 \gg 1$ coincides with Eq.(20).

Note however, that the adiabatic approximation presented here holds whenever the precession speed ω_p is *large* compared to the vibrational frequencies. In addition, ω_p should also be large compared to the rotation frequency Ω . The extreme case $\omega_p = \Omega$ defines a line in the α - Ω plane which for large α approaches asymptotically to the line $\alpha = \Omega$.

7 Discussion

We have shown that our exact analytic results reduce to the formulae derived via the time-averaged orbiting potential approximation, in the case where α is large. In addition, the stability diagram that we found, suggests that the TOP trap is very flexible for the experimentalist in terms of the allowed parameters. We have also shown that under the adiabatic approximation, where the direction of the spin $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is locked to the direction of the field in the *rotating* frame, we recover, for large magnetic field α , the exact mode frequencies.

It is interesting to note that Eqs.(7) and (8) pave the way for a *quantum-mechanical* treatment of the same problem in the comoving frame. When gravity is neglected, the Hamiltonian for this system is given by

$$\hat{H} = \frac{(\hat{\mathbf{P}} - \mathbf{A})^2}{2m} + \mu\sigma^S \cdot \left(\mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu}\Omega_r\hat{\mathbf{z}} \right) - \frac{1}{2}m\Omega_r^2(x^2 + y^2),$$

where \mathbf{A} is a vector potential field satisfying

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{A} \propto \Omega_r\hat{\mathbf{z}},$$

$$\sigma^S = \sigma_x^S\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sigma_y^S\hat{\mathbf{y}} + \sigma_z^S\hat{\mathbf{z}}$$

is the spin S (where S could be either 0 or 1/2 or 1 etc.) vector of Pauli matrices, $\hat{\mathbf{P}}$ is the vector momentum operator, $\mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu}\Omega_r\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is the magnetic field as seen in the rotating frame, and $-m\Omega_r^2(x^2 + y^2)/2$ is the centrifugal potential. In order to diagonalize the magnetic part of the Hamiltonian, one performs a local *passive* transformation of coordinates on the wave function, such that the spinor is expressed in a new coordinate system whose z -axis coincides with the direction of the local magnetic field $\mathbf{H} - \frac{S}{\mu}\Omega_r\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ at the point \mathbf{r} . This rotation does not affect either the centrifugal term or \mathbf{A} . The momentum $\hat{\mathbf{P}}$ however, transforms to $\hat{\mathbf{P}} - \mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{r}, \sigma_x^S, \sigma_y^S, \sigma_z^S)$, where $\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{r}, \sigma_x^S, \sigma_y^S, \sigma_z^S)$ contains *non-diagonal* elements as it includes the spin degree of freedom. For typical values of parameters, the non-diagonal part may be treated as a small perturbation, and the *lifetime* of the particle in the trap may be calculated. This technique has already been applied successfully to a 1D toy-model *time-independent* magnetic trap[9], and to a Ioffe-like 2D trap[10], for the case of

spin $S = 1/2$ particles. As the TOP trap is used to capture *Bosons*, it is more reasonable to study it for the case $S = 1$. We believe that despite the complexity that the Coriolis and centrifugal forces add to the problem, it is possible to solve TOP trap *quantum-mechanically*. The analysis of this problem is still under study.

8 Acknowledgment

It is our pleasure to acknowledge with thanks Prof. H. Thomas for many helpful discussions of the physics of the TOP, which clarified to us the subtleties of this ingenious scheme.

References

- [1] G. P. Collins, *Physics Today*, pp. 17-20, August 1995.
- [2] R. Irion, *New Scientist*, pp. 27-30, June 1998.
- [3] D. J. Han, R. H. Wynar, Ph. Courteille and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. A.*, **57**, 6, pp.4114-4117, June 1998.
- [4] W. Petrich, M. H. Anderson, J. R. Ensher, E. A Cornell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol. 74, No. 17, pp. 3352-3355, April 1995.
- [5] An asymptotically exact equations for the slow dynamics of the neutral particle were derived by J. De Luca, R. Napolitano and V. S. Bagnato, *Phys. Rev. A*, **55** 3, R1597 (1997). See also J. De Luca, R. Napolitano and V. S. Bagnato, *Phys. Lett. A*, **233**, 79-84 (1997).
- [6] The ‘sagging’ of the atoms was already discussed by D. S. Hall, J. R. Ensher, D. S. Jin, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman and E. A. Cornell, *Cond-mat/9903459* and references therein, in connection with a binary mixture of Bose-Einstein condensates in two different hyperfine states of the Rb⁸⁷ atom.
- [7] D. J. Han, R. H. Wynar, Ph. Courteille and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. A*, **57**, 6, pp. 4114-4117 (1998).
- [8] B. P. Anderson, M. A. Kasevich, *Science* **282**, pp. 1686-1689 (1998).
- [9] S. Gov, S. Shtrikman and H. Thomas, ‘1D Toy Model For Trapping Neutral Particles’, *Am. J. Phys.* in press.
- [10] S. Gov, S. Shtrikman and H. Thomas, ‘Neutral Particles Magnetic Traps: Qunatum Mechanical vs. Classical Analysis’, to be published. A copy is found in *Los-Alamos E-Print Archive*, quant-ph/9812079.

Table 1: Comparison of mode frequencies.

Mode	Measured [4]	TOP [4]	Exact Anlaysis
Prec. freq. MHz	-	~ 7	7.38
Axial freq. Hz	67 ± 1	69 ± 2	67.99
Lateral freq. Hz	24 ± 1	24 ± 1	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \pm 24.44 \\ 15K \pm 24.44 \end{array} \right.$

Figure 1: Stable region for $g = 0$ in the α - Ω plane.

