This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Itin, A. P.; Törmä, Päivi

Dynamics of a many-particle Landau-Zener model

Published in:
Physical Review A

DOI:
[10.1103/PhysRevA.79.055602](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.79.055602)

Published: 01/05/2009

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Please cite the original version:
Itin, A. P., & Törmä, P. (2009). Dynamics of a many-particle Landau-Zener model: Inverse sweep. *Physical Review A*, 79(5), 1-3. [055602]. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.79.055602>

This material is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Dynamics of a many-particle Landau-Zener model: Inverse sweep

A. P. Itin^{1,2} and P. Törmä¹¹*Department of Applied Physics, Helsinki University of Technology, P.O. Box 5100, 02015, Finland*²*Space Research Institute, RAS, Profsoyuznaya Str. 84/32, 117997 Moscow, Russia*

(Received 17 February 2009; published 18 May 2009)

We consider dynamics of a slowly time-dependent Dicke model, which represents a many-body generalization of the Landau-Zener model. In particular, the model describes narrow Feshbach resonance passage in an ultracold gas of Fermi atoms. Adiabaticity is destroyed when a parameter crosses a critical value, even at very slow sweeping rates of a parameter. The dynamics crucially depends on direction of the sweep. We apply our recent analysis (A. P. Itin and P. Törmä, e-print arXiv:0901.4778) to the “inverse” sweep through the resonance, corresponding (in a context of Feshbach resonance passage) to dissociation of molecules. On a level of the mean-field approximation, the dynamics is equivalent to a molecular condensate formation from Bose atoms within a two-mode model. Mapping the system to a Painlevé equation allows us to calculate deviation from adiabaticity at very slow sweeps analytically.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.79.055602](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.79.055602)

PACS number(s): 05.45.-a, 64.70.Tg, 71.10.-w, 42.65.-k

Destruction of adiabaticity is a conceptually important issue in both quantum and classical mechanics. Nonadiabatic dynamics of many quantum single-particle systems can be effectively described in terms of the exactly solvable Landau-Zener model [1] (LZM), where a probability of transition from an initially occupied instantaneous ground state level to an excited one is exponentially small in a sweeping rate parameter. Numerous studies have been devoted to such type of models [2].

Many-particle quantum systems are intriguing objects that can exhibit nonlinear behavior and in some sense link quantum and classical worlds together. Interest to such systems has grown enormously due to progress in ultracold quantum gas experiments [3]. Destruction of adiabaticity in semiclassical models of many-particle systems under slow driving has been intensively investigated recently [4–9] using various methods. It has been found that exponential LZM-type behavior for transition probabilities is often replaced with power laws of sweeping rates. Theoretical methods used for derivation of these power laws often involve a number of approximations, whose accuracy is difficult to control.

We considered recently [10] a time-dependent Dicke model [see Eq. (2) below] using concepts of classical adiabatic invariants. Technically, a method which naturally links classical mechanics and quantum dynamics of many-particle systems is a so-called truncated Wigner approximation (TWA) [7,11,12]. Briefly, within this approximation one considers an ensemble of classical trajectories whose initial conditions are distributed in phase space according to a Wigner transform of an initial quantum state. One therefore is left with the problem of nonadiabaticity of individual classical solutions. In classical mechanics, it is known that adiabaticity is destroyed when a phase point crosses or comes close to a separatrix of an unperturbed system [13]. There is a method for calculating changes in approximate adiabatic invariants: separatrix crossing theory [13–15]. The method is not applicable in case a separatrix crossing happens close to or at the time of bifurcation, i.e., in case of very small initial action of a classical trajectory. This drawback was overcome in [16], and we managed to adopt that analysis in [10] by mapping the system close to a bifurcation to a Painlevé

equation [17], those asymptotics are known [18]. A formula for change in the action we derived there allowed describing mean values of number of bosons created at the resonance passage and its distributions. In this Brief Report we consider the “inverse” sweep through the resonance in the same model. We also discuss other physical realizations of the semiclassical model, in particular association of Bose atoms in diatomic molecules within a simple two-mode model [5].

Let us consider the time-dependent Dicke model written in the following form [7,19]:

$$\hat{H} = -\Delta(t)b^\dagger b + \Delta(t)S^z + \frac{g}{\sqrt{N}}(b^\dagger S^- + b S^+), \quad (1)$$

where $\frac{g}{\sqrt{N}}$ is the coupling strength, $S^\pm = S_x \pm iS_y$ are spin operators, $b^\dagger$ and b are creation and destruction operators of a bosonic mode, $\Delta(t) = \pm \epsilon t$ is detuning, and ϵ is the sweeping rate of the bosonic mode energy. $\Delta(t) = +\epsilon t$ for a “forward” sweep through resonance and $-\epsilon t$ for a “backward” or inverse sweep. The spin value S is macroscopically large, $S = N/2 \gg 1$. With $N=2$, one recovers the standard Landau-Zener model. We set $g=1$ for convenience in this Brief Report.

For a forward sweep through the resonance considered in [10], we started in the distant past with some small initial number of bosons $N_b(t)|_{-\infty} = \langle b^\dagger b \rangle(t)|_{-\infty} = N_- \equiv n_- N$ and calculated the final number of bosons $N_b(t)|_{+\infty} = n_+ N$ by averaging over an ensemble of classical trajectories. For a backward sweep, only numerical results were presented by Altland *et al.* [7], consistent with the earlier work in [5]. Our method enables to explain them analytically with high accuracy.

The classical limit of Eq. (1), obtained using the *c-number* formalism [7,9], is

$$H = -\gamma n - 2n\sqrt{1-n} \cos \phi, \quad \gamma = \pm 2\epsilon t, \quad (2)$$

where n corresponds to the number of bosons and ϕ is the canonically conjugated phase. For a forward sweep, $\gamma=2\epsilon t$, while for a backward sweep $\gamma=-2\epsilon t$. Note that by means of a trivial change in variables [20], the Hamiltonian becomes

FIG. 1. Phase portraits of Hamiltonian (2). From (a) to (i): $\gamma = -20, -4, -1.8, -0.9, 0.0, 0.9, 1.8, 20, 100$, correspondingly. Saddle points are denoted by asterisks; the bold trajectory is the separatrix. Shaded areas illustrate definitions of the classical actions (see main text).

the same as analyzed in [9] within the same context and can be derived from semiclassical Bloch equations in [6]. A mean-field model of association of bosonic condensates into a molecular condensate considered in [5] is also equivalent to Eq. (2), with $n=1$ corresponding to “all-atom” mode (i.e., on a mean-field level association of bosonic atoms is analogous to dissociation of molecular condensate of Fermi atoms [21]).

Let us recall the classical phase space of Hamiltonian (2) at fixed values of the parameter γ , as explained in [9]. If $\gamma < -2$, there is only one stable elliptic point on the phase portrait [at $\phi=\pi$ and n not far from 1; see Figs. 1(a) and 1(b)]. At $\gamma=-2$, a bifurcation takes place, and at $|\gamma|<2$ phase portraits look as shown in Figs. 1(c)–1(g). There are two saddle points at $n=0, \cos \phi = -\gamma/2$ and a newborn elliptic point at $\phi=0$. The trajectory connecting these two saddles separates rotations and oscillating motions and it is called the *separatrix* of the frozen system [9]. Finally, at large positive γ , again there is only one elliptic stationary point at $\phi=0$ and n close to 1. The classical action is defined as in [7,9] and is shown graphically in Figs. 1(a), 1(e), and 1(i): shaded areas, divided by 2π . At $\gamma=-\infty$, the action coincides with n : $I=n$. At $\gamma=+\infty$, we have $I=1-n$. For a forward sweep, starting at $t=-\infty$ with certain small $n=n_-$, in the adiabatic limit we get $n_+=1-n_-$ at $t=+\infty$. Analogously, for a backward sweep, starting from a $n_- \approx 1$, in the adiabatic limit we get $n_+=1-n_-$ at $t=+\infty$. Destruction of adiabaticity in both cases is mainly caused by motion near the saddle points located at $n=0$, i.e., no matter in what direction a sweep happens, region of the loss of adiabaticity is the same. For a forward sweep, a classical phase point with $I_-=0$ (i.e., located initially at $n=0$) always remains there. Therefore, when approximating an initial quantum state by an ensemble of classical trajectories, one needs to carefully take into account quantum fluctuations. For a ground state as an initial state,

initial actions of the classical ensemble $\sim 1/N$. For a backward sweep, the situation is different. A phase point with $I_-=0$ is not stationary and therefore in the semiclassical limit, one may merely study its classical dynamics. For small sweeping rates, dynamics remains adiabatic until the phase point approaches a saddle point at $n=0$. Then, following [10], close to a saddle point the system can be mapped to a Painlevé equation. To this end, one introduces new variables $P=2\sqrt{n} \cos \phi/2$, $Y=2\sqrt{n} \sin \phi/2$. After the transformations and approximations described in [10] one obtains the Hamiltonian $H=-s\frac{Y^2}{2}+\frac{P^2}{2}+\frac{Y^4}{2}$, where s is a new time variable and P and Y are canonically conjugated variables. One can see that the effective Hamiltonian leads to the second Painlevé (PII) equation [17,18],

$$\frac{d^2 Y}{ds^2} = sY - 2Y^3. \quad (3)$$

Asymptotics of PII equation were investigated by Its and Kapaev [18]. At $s \rightarrow -\infty$ the asymptotic solution to Eq. (3) is [18,16]

$$Y(s) = \alpha(-s)^{-1/4} \sin\left[\frac{2}{3}(-s)^{3/2} + \frac{3}{4}\alpha^2 \ln(-s) + \varphi\right],$$

and in the limit $s \rightarrow +\infty$ it is

$$Y(s) = \pm \sqrt{\frac{s}{2}} \pm \rho(2s)^{-1/4} \cos\left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}s^{3/2} - \frac{3}{2}\rho^2 \ln(s) + \theta\right),$$

where (α, φ) and (ρ, θ) are the “action-angle” variables characterizing the solutions in the limits $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$. These variables are related by the following relations [18,16]:

$$\rho^2 = \frac{1}{\pi} \ln \frac{1+|p|^2}{2|\text{Im}(p)|},$$

$$\theta = -\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{7}{2}\rho^2 \ln 2 - \arg \Gamma(i\rho^2) - \arg(1+p^2),$$

$$p = [\exp(\pi\alpha^2)]^{1/2} \exp\left[i\frac{3}{2}\alpha^2 \ln 2 - \frac{\pi}{4}i - i \arg \Gamma\left(i\frac{\alpha^2}{2}\right) - i\varphi\right], \quad (4)$$

where $\arg(\cdot)$ denotes the argument of a complex number and $\Gamma(x)$ is the gamma function. As $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$, the adiabatic invariant I_p of system (3) approaches the quantities Γ_p^- or Γ_p^+ which are defined (to the lowest order terms) as

$$\Gamma_p^- = \frac{\alpha^2}{2}, \quad \Gamma_p^+ = \frac{\rho^2}{2}. \quad (5)$$

Relations (4) and (5) allow to us calculate the change in the action both for a forward [10] and a backward sweep.

It turns out that the backward sweep through the resonance has very different behavior from the forward one. Most importantly, in the limit $I_- \rightarrow 0$ change in the action becomes phase independent. That is, at large $I_- \gg \epsilon$ predictions of the Painlevé mapping correspond to the separatrix crossing theory calculations. However, as I_- decreases, the change in the action approaches the phase independent value, which is linearly proportional to ϵ .

Indeed, for a classical trajectory with $I_- = 0$ from Eqs. (4) and (5) it follows [16]

$$I_p^- = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln(1 + |p|^2). \quad (6)$$

For the backward sweep, I_p^- corresponds to I_f , while I_p^+ corresponds to I_- . For the initial action $I_- = 0$ we have $\rho = 0$, $|p| = 1$. Taking into account all the transformations leading to the Painlevé equation, we obtain

$$\Delta I = I_f = \frac{\ln 2}{\pi} \epsilon. \quad (7)$$

This is the main result of the present Brief Report. Numerical calculations (see Fig. 2) reproduce the coefficient $\frac{\ln 2}{\pi}$ with five-digit accuracy. In Ref. [5], a linear power law for deviation from adiabaticity was also found numerically, however the accuracy of the analytical solution reported was lower than in our case.

To conclude, we found that the mapping of the many-particle Landau-Zener model to the Painlevé equation [10] enables to describe not only forward sweep through the resonance but also the reverse driving process. The latter process arises, for example, when the model is used to describe formation of diatomic molecules from Bose atoms or dissociation of diatomic molecules on Fermi atoms. Our results are relevant for accurately describing the Feshbach resonance passage in ultracold Fermi and Bose gases. Interferometric experiment with ultracold quantum gases [22] is another pos-

FIG. 2. (Color online) Change in the classical action for the backward sweep with zero initial action (i.e., $\Delta I = I_f - I_- = I_f$). Inset shows change in the action for small values of ϵ and a linear fit which gives $I_f/\epsilon = 0.220\,631$. Theoretical prediction (7) is $\frac{\ln 2}{\pi} \approx 0.220\,636$.

sible area of applications. Finally, we believe the method will have important applications in the field of *dynamics of quantum phase transitions* (QPTs) [23–25].

This work was supported by the Academy of Finland (Projects No. 213362, No. 217041, No. 217043, and No. 210953) and conducted as a part of a EURYI scheme grant. A.P.I. was partly supported by RFBR under Grant No. 09-01-00333. A.P.I. is indebted to A. I. Neishtadt for illuminating discussions.

-
- [1] L. Landau, Phys. Z. Sowjetunion **2**, 46 (1932); C. Zener, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **137**, 696 (1932).
 - [2] Y. N. Demkov, Sov. Phys. Dokl. **11**, 138 (1966); V. I. Osherov, Sov. Phys. JETP **22**, 804 (1966); C. E. Carrol and F. T. Hioe, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **2**, 1355 (1985); Y. Kayanuma and S. Fukuchi, J. Phys. B **18**, 4089 (1985); K.-A. Suominen, B. M. Garraway, and S. Stenholm, Opt. Commun. **82**, 260 (1991); V. M. Akulin and W. P. Schleich, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 4110 (1992).
 - [3] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 885 (2008); S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, *ibid.* **80**, 1215 (2008).
 - [4] O. Zobay and B. M. Garraway, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 033603 (2000); J. Liu *et al.*, *ibid.* **66**, 023404 (2002).
 - [5] A. Ishkhanyan, M. Mackie, A. Carmichael, P. L. Gould, and J. Javanainen, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 043612 (2004).
 - [6] I. Tikhonenkov, E. Pazy, Y. B. Band, M. Fleischhauer, and A. Vardi, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 043605 (2006).
 - [7] A. Altland *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042703 (2009).
 - [8] A. P. Itin and S. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 026218 (2007).
 - [9] A. P. Itin *et al.*, Physica D **232**, 108 (2007).
 - [10] A. P. Itin and P. Törmä, e-print arXiv:0901.4778.
 - [11] P. D. Drummond and A. D. Hardman, Europhys. Lett. **21**, 279 (1993).
 - [12] A. Polkovnikov, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 033609 (2003).
 - [13] V. I. Arnold, V. V. Kozlov, and A. I. Neishtadt, *Mathematical Aspects of Classical and Celestial Mechanics*, 3rd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2006).
 - [14] J. R. Cary, D. F. Escande, and J. L. Tennyson, Phys. Rev. A **34**, 4256 (1986).
 - [15] A. I. Neishtadt, Sov. J. Plasma Phys. **12**, 568 (1986).
 - [16] D. L. Vainshtein *et al.*, Plasma Phys. Rep. **25**, 299 (1999).
 - [17] P. Painlevé, Acta Math. **25**, 1 (1902).
 - [18] A. R. Its and A. A. Kapaev, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat. **51**, 878 (1987).
 - [19] R. Barankov and L. Levitov, e-print arXiv:cond-mat/0506323.
 - [20] $\tilde{n} = w = 1 - 2n$, $\tilde{\phi} = \pi - \phi$, $\tilde{H} = \sqrt{2}H$, $\tilde{t} = \sqrt{2}t$, $\delta = \gamma/\sqrt{2}$. Omitting tildes, $H = \delta(w - 1) + (1 - w)\sqrt{1 + w \cos \phi}$.
 - [21] Reference [5] considered system $\{i\dot{\alpha} = \frac{\Omega}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha^*\beta, i\dot{\beta} = \frac{\Omega}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha^2 + \delta\beta\}$, with $|\alpha|^2 = 1$ corresponding to the all-atom mode. Denoting $n = |\alpha|^2$, $\phi = 2 \arg(\alpha) - \arg(\beta)$, after simple rescalings we get Hamiltonian (2).
 - [22] V. Gritsev *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **2**, 705 (2006).
 - [23] A. Polkovnikov, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 161201(R) (2005).
 - [24] W. H. Zurek, U. Dorner, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 105701 (2005); J. Dziarmaga, *ibid.* **95**, 245701 (2005).
 - [25] A. Polkovnikov and V. Gritsev, Nat. Phys. **4**, 477 (2008).