

# Control of Ultra-cold Inelastic Collisions by Feshbach Resonances and Quasi-One-Dimensional Confinement

V. A. Yurovsky

*School of Chemistry, Tel Aviv University, 69978 Tel Aviv, Israel*

Y. B. Band

*Departments of Chemistry, Electro-Optics, and The Ilse Katz Center for Nano-Science,  
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel*

(Dated: April 12, 2018)

Cold inelastic collisions of atoms or molecules are analyzed using very general arguments. In free space, the deactivation rate can be enhanced or suppressed together with the scattering length of the corresponding elastic collision via a Feshbach resonance, and by interference of deactivation of the closed and open channels. In reduced dimensional geometries, the deactivation rate decreases with decreasing collision energy and does not increase with resonant elastic scattering length. This has broad implications; e.g., stabilization of molecules in a strongly confining two-dimensional optical lattice, since collisional decay of the highly vibrationally excited states due to inelastic collisions is suppressed. The relation of our results with those based on the Lieb-Liniger model are addressed.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Nk, 82.20.Xr, 03.75.Lm, 34.50.Pi

Feshbach resonances [1, 2] have been used to control atomic interactions in trapped ultracold quantum gases by tuning a magnetic field near a diatomic molecule Feshbach resonance to convert atoms into weakly bound molecules. For fermionic atoms the molecules formed were remarkably long-lived [3], whereas for bosonic atoms in a BEC [4], collisional decay of the highly excited vibrational molecular state occurs [5] and only a small fraction of molecules is observed in this case.

Here we show, using general scattering theory arguments, that inelastic ultra-cold collisions in reduced dimension can be strongly suppressed. This generalizes the work of Ref. [6], which uses the exactly solvable Lieb-Liniger many-body model for indistinguishable bosons in one-dimension (1D) [7], to all kinds of quasi-1D scattering processes occurring in atomic waveguides, e.g., collisions of atoms and molecules. Quasi-1D scattering occurs in a gas in the presence of a waveguide potential that confines a 3D gas sufficiently tightly in two directions so the radial confinement energy  $\omega_{\perp}$  (in units where  $\hbar = 1$ ) is much larger than the collision energy [8], as in 2D optical lattices [9], elongated atomic traps [10], and atomic integrated optics devices [11]. This suppression has broad implications, e.g., it can be used to stabilize molecules produced from bosonic atoms in tight atomic waveguides, since vibrational-to-translational energy-transfer collision rates are significantly reduced relative to the 3D rates at low collision energy. Suppression of inelastic scattering can also occur in collisions of other excited collision partners (e.g., in hyperfine excited atom collisions). Long-lived excited ultracold atoms and molecules may be useful in quantum interferometry and quantum computation.

The theoretical framework for calculating atom-diatom scattering can be drawn along the lines of the Arthurs

and Dalgarno model [12]. The scattering state  $|\Psi\rangle$  can be expressed in term of a sum over basis functions,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_j \psi_j(\mathbf{r}) |\chi_j\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}$  is the atom-diatom relative coordinate,  $\psi_j(\mathbf{r})$  is the relative wave function, and  $|\chi_j\rangle$  includes molecular and center-of-mass degrees of freedom for channel  $j$ . We shall not require details of this model since our arguments are very general, and in fact extend beyond this particular problem (e.g., molecule-molecule collisions).

Low-energy inelastic exoergic collisions in the presence of a Feshbach resonance can often be treated as multi-channel scattering with zero-range interactions described by boundary conditions for  $s$ -wave radial wave functions  $\varphi_j(r) = \frac{r}{4\pi} \int \psi_j(\mathbf{r}) d\Omega_r$  (see [13] and references therein). In our case of low energy inelastic scattering resulting in deactivation of the excited state of a molecule, the boundary conditions take the form,

$$\left. \frac{d\varphi_j(r)}{dr} \right|_{r=0} = \sum_{k=o,c,\{d\}} U_{jk} \varphi_k(0), \quad (2)$$

for the input channel  $\varphi_o$ , the closed channel  $\varphi_c$ , and the deactivation product  $\varphi_d$  having a set of output channels  $\{d\}$ . This method is applicable to collisions of any type of particles when  $s$ -wave scattering is allowed. Note that broad Feshbach molecules [14] cannot be treated using the zero-range approach of Eq. (2). However, if one is considering atom-molecule or molecule-molecule collisions, the resonance does not coincide with the resonance in atom-atom collisions, e.g., two resonances in collisions of  $\text{Cs}_2$  molecules have been observed at 12.72 and 13.15 G [15], far off the atom-atom resonance at 19.84 G.

When the coupling of the input channel to the other channels vanishes, Eq. (2) reduces to the Bethe-Peierls

boundary condition,

$$\left. \frac{d\varphi_o(r)}{dr} \right|_{r=0} = -\frac{1}{a_{\text{bg}}} \varphi_o(0) \{\text{uncoupled}\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $a_{\text{bg}}$  is the non-resonant background elastic scattering length. Hence, from (2), we find that  $U_{00} = -1/a_{\text{bg}}$ .

Outside the interaction region,  $\psi_o(\mathbf{r})$  satisfies the Schrödinger equation,

$$-\frac{1}{2M} \nabla^2 \psi_o(\mathbf{r}) + V_{\text{conf}}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_o(\mathbf{r}) = E \psi_o(\mathbf{r}), \quad (4)$$

where  $V_{\text{conf}}$  is the confining waveguide trapping potential,  $E$  is the collision energy, and  $M$  is the reduced mass of the colliding particles. Moreover, the radial wave functions  $\varphi_c$  and  $\varphi_d$  satisfy the Schrödinger equations

$$-\frac{1}{2M} \frac{d^2 \varphi_{c,d}}{dr^2} \pm D_{c,d} \varphi_{c,d}(r) = E \varphi_{c,d}(r), \quad (5)$$

where  $D_c$  is the asymptotic value of the closed channel potential,  $D_d$  is the deactivation energy for channel  $d$ , and we assumed that  $V_{\text{conf}} \ll D_{c,d}$ . These equations can be solved to obtain

$$\varphi_c = \varphi_c(0) \exp\left(-\sqrt{2M(D_c - E)} r\right), \quad (6)$$

$$\varphi_d(r) = R_d \exp(ip_d r), \quad (7)$$

where  $p_d = \sqrt{2M(E + D_d)}$ . The closed channel has an attractive potential ( $U_{cc} < 0$ ) and a single bound state with energy  $E_{\text{Fesh}} = D_c - U_{cc}^2/(2M)$ .

Substitution of Eqs. (6) and (7) into (2) leads to the following boundary condition:

$$\left. \frac{d\varphi_o(r)}{dr} \right|_{r=0} = -\frac{1}{a_{\text{eff}}} \varphi_o(0). \quad (8)$$

The deactivation energies typically substantially exceed all interaction energies. Therefore only the contributions of zero and first orders in  $|U_{jk}|/p_d$  need be retained. To this accuracy we can neglect terms proportional to  $U_{dd}$  in (2), so the amplitudes  $R_d$  can be expressed as

$$R_d = -i \frac{\varphi_o(0)}{p_d} \left[ U_{do} - \frac{U_{dc} \mu \Delta}{a_{\text{bg}} U_{oc} (E_\delta - i\Gamma_c)} \right],$$

with

$$\Gamma_c = \frac{\mu \Delta}{a_{\text{bg}} |U_{oc}|^2} \sum_d \frac{1}{p_d} |U_{cd}|^2.$$

Here,  $\Delta = a_{\text{bg}} |U_{cc}| |U_{oc}|^2 / (\mu M)$  is the resonance strength,  $\mu$  is the difference of the magnetic moments in the closed and open channels, and

$$E_\delta = \frac{|U_{cc}|}{M} \left[ \sqrt{U_{cc}^2 + 2M(E_{\text{Fesh}} - E)} - |U_{cc}| \right] \quad (9)$$

is an effective detuning.

The length  $a_{\text{eff}}$  has an imaginary part due to coupling to the deactivation channels and can be expressed as

$$a_{\text{eff}} = a_{\text{bg}} \frac{E_\delta - i\Gamma_c}{E_\delta + \mu \Delta - i\Gamma}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\Gamma = \sum_d \frac{1}{p_d} \left[ \frac{|U_{dc}|^2 \mu \Delta}{a_{\text{bg}} |U_{oc}|^2} + 2\mu \Delta \Re \left( \frac{U_{od} U_{dc}}{U_{oc}} \right) - a_{\text{bg}} |U_{do}|^2 E_\delta \right].$$

For a tightly bound closed-channel state, or when the detuning of the collision energy from the Feshbach energy is small,  $|E_{\text{Fesh}} - E| \ll U_{cc}^2/M$ , then  $E_\delta \approx E_{\text{Fesh}} - E$ . In this case, neglecting deactivation, one can approximate  $a_{\text{eff}}$  by the real effective energy-dependent length [16],

$$a_{\text{eff}}(E) \approx a_{\text{bg}} \left[ 1 + \frac{\mu \Delta}{E - \mu(B - B_0)} \right], \quad (11)$$

where  $B - B_0 \equiv \Delta + E_{\text{Fesh}}/\mu$  is the detuning of the external magnetic field  $B$  from its resonant value  $B_0$ .

The deactivation cross section can be expressed as

$$\sigma = 4\pi \sum_d \varphi_d^* \frac{1}{iM} \frac{d}{dr} \varphi_d = \frac{4\pi S}{M} |\varphi_o(0)|^2, \quad (12)$$

where  $\varphi_o$  corresponds to the input channel wave function normalized to unit incident flux density, and the factor

$$S = \sum_d \frac{1}{p_d} \left| U_{do} - \frac{U_{dc} \mu \Delta}{a_{\text{bg}} U_{oc} (E_\delta - i\Gamma_c)} \right|^2 \quad (13)$$

describes interference of deactivation of the closed and open channel states.

First, we consider collisions in free space ( $V_{\text{conf}} = 0$ ). The proper solution of Eq. (4) has the form

$$\psi_o(\mathbf{r}) = \sqrt{\frac{M}{p_0}} \left[ \exp(i\mathbf{p}_0 \cdot \mathbf{r}) - \frac{1}{a_{\text{eff}}^{-1} + ip_0} \frac{1}{r} \exp(ip_0 r) \right], \quad (14)$$

where the collision momentum is  $p_0 = \sqrt{2ME}$ . For low-energy collisions, when  $a_{\text{bg}} p_0 \ll 1$ , we find

$$\varphi_o(0) = -\sqrt{\frac{M}{p_0}} a_{\text{eff}}. \quad (15)$$

The deactivation cross-section

$$\sigma_{\text{free}} = \frac{4\pi S}{p_0} |a_{\text{eff}}|^2 \quad (16)$$

diverges at low collision energies, while the deactivation rate coefficient

$$K_{\text{free}} = \frac{p_0}{M} \sigma_{\text{free}} \approx \frac{4\pi S}{M} |a_{\text{eff}}|^2 \quad (17)$$

has a finite non-zero limit proportional to  $|a_{\text{eff}}|^2$ . The deactivation is suppressed at  $E_\delta = 0$ , where  $a_{\text{eff}}$  is close to

zero. Under certain conditions it can also be suppressed due to interference in the factor  $S$ . The deactivation is enhanced near resonance of  $a_{\text{eff}}$  at  $E_\delta = -\mu\Delta$ . In this case it can reach a maximum value of

$$K_{\text{free,max}} \approx \frac{4\pi S}{M} \left( \frac{a_{\text{bg}}\mu\Delta}{\Gamma} \right)^2. \quad (18)$$

Consider now collisions in a transverse harmonic waveguide. This problem has been analyzed in Refs. [8, 17] for a single-channel Huang pseudopotential, which is equivalent to the boundary condition in Eq. (3). The case of a multichannel  $\delta$ -function interaction has been considered in Ref. [16] using a renormalization procedure. Equations (17) and (19) in [16] express the proper solution of Eq. (4) in terms of the transverse Hamiltonian eigenfunctions  $|n0\rangle$  with zero angular momentum projection on the waveguide axis,  $z$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_o(\mathbf{r}) &= a_\perp \sqrt{\frac{\pi M}{p_0}} \left[ \exp(ip_0 z) |00\rangle - \frac{1}{2} M a_\perp \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times T_{\text{conf}}(p_0) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\exp(ip_n |z|) |n0\rangle}{\sqrt{n - (p_0 a_\perp / 2)^2}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here  $a_\perp = (M\omega_\perp)^{-1/2}$  is the transverse harmonic oscillator length,  $\omega_\perp$  is the waveguide transverse frequency,  $p_n = \sqrt{2M[E - (2n+1)\omega_\perp]}$ ,

$$T_{\text{conf}}(p_0) = \frac{2}{M a_\perp} \left[ \frac{a_\perp}{a_{\text{eff}}} + \zeta \left( \frac{1}{2}, - \left( \frac{a_\perp p_0}{2} \right)^2 \right) \right]^{-1} \quad (20)$$

is the transition matrix, and  $\zeta(\nu, \alpha)$  is the Hurwitz zeta function [17, 18]. The wave function (19) is normalized so the average incident flux density per waveguide area  $\pi a_\perp^2$  is unity. The sum in Eq. (19) diverges as  $r \rightarrow 0$ . The divergent part can be evaluated as  $a_\perp/r$  [17]. This leads to  $\varphi_o(0) = -\frac{1}{2} M a_\perp^2 \sqrt{M/p_0} T_{\text{conf}}(p_0)$ , and to the deactivation rate coefficient

$$K_{\text{conf}} = \pi M a_\perp^4 |T_{\text{conf}}|^2 S. \quad (21)$$

For weak confinement, when  $a_\perp p_0 \gg 1$ , approximation (49) in Ref. [16] leads again to Eq. (14) for the wave function and to Eq. (17) for the deactivation rate. For strong confinement, when  $a_\perp p_0 \ll 1$ , approximation (41) in Ref. [16] leads to

$$T_{\text{conf}}(p_0) \approx -i \frac{p_0}{M} \left( 1 + \frac{i}{2} C a_\perp p_0 - i \frac{a_\perp^2 p_0}{2 a_{\text{eff}}} \right)^{-1}, \quad (22)$$

where  $C \approx 1.4603$ . At low collision energies, or at large  $a_{\text{eff}}$ , where  $p_0 \ll |a_{\text{eff}}|/a_\perp^2$ , the wave function at the origin,  $\varphi_o(0) \approx \frac{1}{2} a_\perp^2 \sqrt{M/p_0}$ , is much less than the corresponding value of  $\varphi_o(0)$  in free space given in Eq. (15). Thus confinement prevents the particles from occupying the same position. A similar effect is responsible for




FIG. 1: (color online) Scaled deactivation rate coefficient  $\frac{KM}{4\pi S a_\perp^2}$  as a function of scaled magnetic field detuning  $b = \mu(B - B_0)/(2\omega_\perp) - \frac{1}{2}$  and collision energy  $\varepsilon = E/(2\omega_\perp) - \frac{1}{2}$ , calculated for  $a_{\text{bg}} = 0.1 a_\perp$  and  $\mu\Delta = 2\omega_\perp$ . In the confined geometry, the solid and dashed curves correspond to  $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$  and  $\varepsilon = 0.5$  respectively, whereas the free space results are given by the dot-dashed and dotted curves respectively. The inset shows deactivation rate versus  $\varepsilon$  in confined geometry for  $b = 0$  (solid curve) and  $b = 100$  (dashed curve).

fermionization of 1D bosons with strong interactions [8]. Under these conditions the deactivation rate,

$$K_{\text{conf}} \approx \frac{a_\perp^4 p_0^2}{4|a_{\text{eff}}|^2} K_{\text{free}}, \quad (23)$$

can be substantially suppressed by confinement.

This conclusion is graphically demonstrated in Fig. 1 under conditions when  $a_{\text{eff}}$  is expressed by Eq. (11). It shows resonances in the deactivation rate at  $E_\delta = -\mu\Delta$  for collision energies comparable to  $\omega_\perp$  and in free space, as well as deactivation suppression near  $E_\delta = 0$ . At low collision energies, when

$$p_0 \ll |a_{\text{bg}}|/a_\perp^2, \quad (24)$$

deactivation under confinement does not have resonances and can be strongly suppressed even compared to the non-resonant process in free space. Suppression appears also at  $E = (2k+1)\omega_\perp$ , where excitations of transverse waveguide modes become open, leading to jumps in the elastic scattering amplitude [16, 19].

The above results are obtained for a system composed of two arbitrary types of particles interacting via  $s$ -wave scattering. A suppression of inelastic collision has been predicted in Ref. [6] for a many-body system of 1D indistinguishable bosons using the Lieb-Liniger model [7]. However, as we shall see below, the suppression is mostly a two-body interaction effect even in this model.

Consider first the two-body scattering with particle momenta  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . The Lieb-Liniger wave func-

tion with unit norm in interval  $[0, L]$  ( $L \rightarrow \infty$ ) is,

$$\Psi_{p_1 p_2}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}L} \left[ \exp(ip_1 z_1 + ip_2 z_2) + \frac{p_1 - p_2 - imU_a}{p_1 - p_2 + imU_a} \exp(ip_1 z_2 + ip_2 z_1) \right],$$

for  $0 \leq z_1 \leq z_2 < L$  and  $\Psi_{p_1 p_2}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2) = \Psi_{p_1 p_2}^{(2)}(z_2, z_1)$  for  $0 \leq z_2 \leq z_1 < L$ . Here  $m$  is the particle mass, and  $U_a \approx 4a_{\text{bg}} [ma_{\perp}^2 (1 - Ca_{\text{bg}}/a_{\perp})]^{-1}$  is the interaction strength [8]. The two-body correlation function with the particles at the same position,

$$g_2^{(2)}(p_1, p_2) = \left| \Psi_{p_1 p_2}^{(2)}(0, 0) \right|^2 = \frac{2}{L^2} \frac{(p_1 - p_2)^2}{(p_1 - p_2)^2 + m^2 U_a^2} \quad (25)$$

is the probability to find two particles at the same place. Equation (25) already describes qualitatively the behavior of  $g_2$  when the ratio of the interaction to collision energies is large, as obtained in [6],  $g_2 \sim (p_1 - p_2)^2 / U_a^2$ .

In the  $N$ -body case, the two-body correlation function  $g_2^{(N)}$  can be estimated as a sum of  $g_2^{(2)}$  over all pairs of the colliding particles with the quasimomenta  $p_j$  and  $p_{j'}$ ,

$$g_2^{(N)} \approx \sum_{j < j'} g_2^{(2)}(p_j, p_{j'}) \approx \frac{L^2}{2} \int dp_1 dp_2 f(p_1) f(p_2) g_2^{(2)}(p_1, p_2), \quad (26)$$

where the values of the quasimomenta  $p_j$  are determined by boundary conditions and the summation is replaced by integration with the quasimomentum distribution functions  $f(p)$  [7]. The system properties are determined by the dimensionless parameter  $\gamma = mU_a/\rho$ , where  $\rho = N/L$  is the linear particle density. Approximate analytical expressions for  $f(p)$  in the ground state have been obtained in Ref. [7] for the mean-field regime,  $\gamma \ll 1$ , and for the Tonks-Girardeau regime,  $\gamma \gg 1$ . In the mean-field regime, substitution of  $f(p) \approx \pi^{-1} \gamma^{-1/2} \sqrt{1 - p^2/(4\rho^2 \gamma)}$  into Eq. (26) leads to

$$g_2^{(N)} \approx \rho^2, \quad (27)$$

in full agreement with the results of Ref. [6]. In the Tonks-Girardeau regime,  $f(p) \approx 1/(2\pi)$  for  $|p| < \pi\rho$  and  $f(p) = 0$  otherwise, and (26) leads to

$$g_2^{(N)} \approx \frac{2\pi^2 \rho^2}{3\gamma^2}. \quad (28)$$

This value is half the exact value determined in Ref. [6]. The difference can be related to higher order correlations, which are neglected here (the two-body picture can only include second order correlations). However, (28) describes the correct behavior of  $g_2^{(N)}$  as  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , leading to suppression of all kinds of collision phenomena under

tight confinement when  $mU_a/\rho \gg 1$  [this condition has the same meaning as Eq. (24)].

In summary, inelastic collision rates in free space demonstrate resonances and dips, being proportional to  $|a_{\text{eff}}|^2$ , and are capped by (18). Interference of deactivation of the open and closed channels can also suppress the rate. In quasi-1D scattering at low collision energies [see Eq. (24)], inelastic collisions do not have resonances and are suppressed. This result applies to the collision of any type of atoms or molecules interacting via  $s$ -waves and is not based upon the 1D Bose gas Lieb-Liniger model.

This work was supported in part by grants from the U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation (grant No. 2002147), the Israel Science Foundation for a Center of Excellence (grant No. 8006/03), and the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) through the DIP project. Useful conversations with Paul Julienne and Brett Esry are gratefully acknowledged.

- 
- [1] H. Feshbach, *Ann. Phys.* **19**, 287 (1962); H. Feshbach, *Theoretical Nuclear Physics*, (Wiley, NY, 1992).
  - [2] E. Timmermans *et al.*, *Phys. Rep.* **315**, 199 (1999).
  - [3] M. Greiner, C. A. Regal, and D. Jin, *Nature (London)* **426**, 537 (2003); S. Jochim *et al.*, *Science* **302**, 2101 (2003); J. Cubizolles *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 240401 (2003); K. E. Strecker, G.B. Partridge, and R. G. Hulet, *ibid.* **91**, 080406 (2003); M. W. Zwierlein *et al.*, *ibid.* **92**, 120403 (2004).
  - [4] E. A. Donley *et al.*, *Nature* **417**, 529 (2002); J. Herbig *et al.*, *Science* **301**, 1510 (2003); K. Xu *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 210402 (2003); S. Dürr *et al.*, *ibid.* **92**, 020406 (2004).
  - [5] V. A. Yurovsky and A. Ben-Reuven, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 043611 (2003); **70**, 013613. (2004); **72**, 053618 (2005).
  - [6] D. M. Gangardt and G. V. Shlyapnikov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 010401 (2003).
  - [7] E. H. Lieb and W. Liniger, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 1605 (1963).
  - [8] M. Olshanii, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 938 (1998).
  - [9] M. Greiner *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 160405 (2001); H. Moritz *et al.*, *ibid.* **94**, 210401 (2005); T. Kinoshita, T. Wenger, and D. Weiss, *Science* **305**, 1125 (2004); B. L. Tolra *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 190401 (2004); C. D. Fertig *et al.*, *ibid.* **94**, 120403 (2005).
  - [10] A. Görlitz *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 130402 (2001); A. E. Leanhardt *et al.*, *ibid.* **89**, 040401 (2002); K. Strecker *et al.*, *Nature* **417**, 150 (2002); L. Khaykovich *et al.*, *Science* **296**, 1290 (2002); S. Richard *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** 010405 (2003); M. Hugbart *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **35**, 155 (2005).
  - [11] R. Folman *et al.*, *Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **48**, 263 (2002); Y. Shin *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 021604 (2005).
  - [12] A. M. Arthurs and A. Dalgarno, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **A256**, 540 (1960).
  - [13] Yu. N. Demkov and V.N. Ostrovskii, *Zero-range Potentials and their Applications in Atomic Physics*, (Plenum Press, NY, 1988); O. I. Kartavtsev and J. H. Macek, *Few-Body Systems* **31**, 249 (2002); Y. E. Kim and A. L. Zubarev, *Phys. Lett.* **A312**, 277 (2003).

- [14] T. Köhler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 230401 (2003).
- [15] C. Chin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 123201 (2005).
- [16] V. A. Yurovsky, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 012709 (2005).
- [17] M. Moore, T. Bergeman, and M. Olshanii, J. Phys. (Paris) IV **116**, 69 (2004).
- [18] H. Bateman and A. Erdelyi, *Higher Transcendental Functions*, Vol. 2 (McGraw-Hill, NY, 1953).
- [19] B. E. Granger and D. Blume, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 133202 (2004).