

Pseudopotential model of ultracold atomic collisions in quasi-one- and two-dimensional traps

E. L. Bolda, E. Tiesinga, and P. S. Julienne

*Atomic Physics Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology,
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 8423, Gaithersburg MD 20899-8423*

(Dated: November 6, 2018)

We describe a model for s -wave collisions between ground state atoms in optical lattices, considering especially the limits of quasi-one and two dimensional axisymmetric harmonic confinement. When the atomic interactions are modelled by an s -wave Fermi-pseudopotential, the relative motion energy eigenvalues can easily be obtained. The results show that except for a bound state, the trap eigenvalues are consistent with one- and two- dimensional scattering with renormalized scattering amplitudes. For absolute scattering lengths large compared with the tightest trap width, our model predicts a novel bound state of low energy and nearly-isotropic wavefunction extending on the order of the tightest trap width.

PACS numbers: 32.80.Pj, 32.80Lg, 34.50.-s

I. INTRODUCTION

Unprecedented control has been gained over atomic collisions through cooling to nanoKelvin temperatures and selection of internal hyperfine states. Further control of these systems is now being gained by manipulating the atoms with external fields, including magnetic fields and optical lattices. An opportune example where both collisions and the external trapping potential are essential is the superfluid-Mott insulator transition in an optical lattice. This transition was recently demonstrated by beginning with an atomic Bose-Einstein condensate and adiabatically turning on an optical lattice [1]. The final Mott insulator state has a fixed number of atoms per lattice site. Such a system represents an ideal ensemble for measuring scattering properties of the atoms. The free-space scattering amplitudes determine the energy eigenvalues and loss rates of the system and *vice versa*.

There are many current and proposed applications of cold atoms in optical lattices. One is high-precision measurement of atomic potentials, by determining positions of weakly-bound molecular states for example [2]. Another is the implementation of quantum logic gates with neutral atoms. Several proposed implementations combine optical lattices with internal-state-dependent cold collisions [3, 4]. One can also consider the combination of an optical lattice along one or two directions and a weak dipole trap in the remaining directions. Such highly anisotropic trapping configurations were already used in experiments on Bose-Einstein condensate number-squeezing [5] and controlled loading [6], as well as looking for dimensional effects on the condensate density [7]. Optical [8] or magnetic [9] waveguides have been used for guiding cold atoms. These quasi-one- and two-dimensional configurations can be combined with a tunable scattering length, such as from magnetic Feshbach resonance, to lead to new physical regimes. Workers on Bose-Einstein condensate experiments are observing increased phase-fluctuation in the crossover to one dimen-

sion [10, 11]. Theoretically, the (one-dimensional) Tonks gas regime can occur at low density when bosons are tightly confined along two directions and weakly confined along the third [12, 13]. One-half anyon statistics and the fractional quantum Hall effect may be possible for bosons confined tightly along one direction and weakly along the other two [14]. Another proposal is the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition for interacting bosons in two-dimensions [15]. For all these applications, one first needs to understand the relation between cold collisions in free space and in a trap with arbitrary geometry. Then the many-body physics can be treated on the basis of effective low-dimensional interactions. In this article, we show how to compute the eigenvalues from the free-space scattering data and trap frequencies for arbitrary axisymmetric harmonic traps, emphasizing the one- and two-dimensional regimes. We also describe a novel bound state induced by the trap in both low-dimensional regimes when the scattering length is large in magnitude.

Previous theoretical work has included exact solutions of collisions for special interatomic potentials in an *isotropic* harmonic trap [16, 17], and comparison with results including realistic ground-state interatomic potentials. We have shown how an effective-scattering-length combined with a Fermi pseudopotential can be used to calculate the energy eigenvalues for collisions in an isotropic harmonic trap [2, 18]. We compared our model with full interaction potential results for both a single-channel collision and a multi-channel collision with a magnetically tunable Feshbach resonance. In both cases, the model can accurately treat tight traps, as long as the trap size is larger than the van der Waals scale length. On the strength of this evidence we propose to also apply the effective-scattering length model to treat ground state collisions in axisymmetric harmonic traps.

The effect of confinement along only one or two dimensions has also been considered theoretically by others. For one dimension, the scattering could be represented by a one-dimensional delta function provided the coupling strength was renormalized by the confin-

ing trap [12]. Quasi-two-dimensional scattering solutions were found for two dimensions, where the renormalization is of the two-dimensional scattering length [19]. We will consider the applicability of these two results in the case of very prolate and oblate traps respectively.

The outline of our paper is as follows. In the next section, we state the problem of atoms colliding in an axisymmetric trap and the regime of applicability of our effective-scattering-length model. In Sec. III we show how this problem can be solved in a particular basis. Sec. IV contains the results of the calculation for the one-dimensional regime and a comparison with a one-dimensional scattering theory; Sec. V contains the same but for the two-dimensional regime. In Sec. VI we discuss a novel trap-induced bound state which appears in both the one- and two-dimensional regimes for large positive or negative scattering length. We give an example of magnetically tunable Feshbach resonance for Na atoms in quasi-one-dimension in Sec. VII. We conclude the paper in Sec. VIII. In the appendix we derive the matrix elements of the anisotropic potential required for the calculation.

II. TWO ATOMS COLLIDING IN AN ANISOTROPIC HARMONIC TRAP

We assume ultracold atoms are trapped in an optical lattice detuned far off resonance. Specific optical lattice potentials for different angular and polarization configurations are calculated in [20]. For our purposes we assume that two atoms in specific internal sublevels remain near a local minimum of the potential. With the assumption of local azimuthal symmetry about an axis through a potential minimum, we approximate the anisotropic potential near a particular site by

$$V_t(\mathbf{r}_j) = \frac{1}{2}m [\omega_\perp^2(x_j^2 + y_j^2) + \omega_z^2 z_j^2], \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{r}_j is the positions of atom $j = 1$ or 2 , m is the atomic mass, and ω_\perp and ω_z are trapping frequencies. We define the trap anisotropy

$$A = \frac{\omega_z}{\omega_\perp} \quad (2)$$

so that one-dimensional physics is approached for the oblate trap $A \ll 1$ ("cigar") and two-dimensional physics for the prolate trap $A \gg 1$ ("pancake"). The length scales associated with the transverse and longitudinal trap directions are

$$d_\perp = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{\mu\omega_\perp}}, \quad d_z = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{\mu\omega_z}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mu = m/2$ is the reduced mass of the atom pair.

As in the case of an isotropic harmonic trap, the center of mass and relative motion are separable. The center of mass motion is independent of the interatomic potential,

$V_{\text{int}}(r)$, and has the usual harmonic oscillator solutions. The relative coordinate Hamiltonian is given in spherical coordinates by

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{\hat{L}^2}{2\mu r^2} + V(r, \theta) + V_{\text{int}}(r) \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2$ and $r = |\mathbf{r}|$. The interatomic orbital angular momentum operator \hat{L} gives the partial wave quantum numbers $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ for s -, p -, d -, ... waves. The potential due to the trap written in terms of the spherical harmonic Y_{20} is

$$V(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}\mu\omega^2 r^2 \left[1 + \sqrt{\frac{16\pi}{5}} \Lambda Y_{20}(\theta, 0) \right], \quad (5)$$

where the mean-square trap frequency appears as

$$\omega = \sqrt{\frac{2\omega_\perp^2 + \omega_z^2}{3}} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\Lambda = \frac{\omega_z^2 - \omega_\perp^2}{\omega_z^2 + 2\omega_\perp^2} = \frac{A^2 - 1}{A^2 + 2}. \quad (7)$$

The term proportional to Λ in Eq. (5) defines the anisotropic part $\hat{H}^{(1)}$ of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{H}^{(0)} + \hat{H}^{(1)}$. The length scale associated with the mean-square frequency is defined to be

$$d = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{\mu\omega}}. \quad (8)$$

The interatomic $V_{\text{int}}(r)$ potential for two ground state atoms approaches $-C_6/r^6$ at large internuclear separation r . The associated van der Waals length scale is $x_0 = (2\mu C_6/\hbar^2)^{1/4}/2$ [21, 22, 23]. It gives the approximate size of the potential, that is, the wavefunction takes on its asymptotic scattering form for $r \gg x_0$. We have previously approximated the exact Born-Oppenheimer potential by the energy-dependent Fermi pseudopotential [2, 18, 24]

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}}(r; E) = \frac{4\pi\hbar^2 a_{\text{eff}}(E)}{m} \delta(\mathbf{r}) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r. \quad (9)$$

The dependence on collision energy E is due to the energy-dependent scattering length, defined as

$$a_{\text{eff}}(E) = -\frac{\tan \delta_0(E)}{k}, \quad (10)$$

where $E = \hbar^2 k^2/2\mu$ and $\delta_0(E)$ is the s -wave collisional phase shift. S -wave scattering predominates for ultracold collisions except for the case of identical fermions.

The pseudopotential approximation is valid provided the van der Waals length scale x_0 is less than the smallest harmonic oscillator width, $x_0 \ll \min\{d_\perp, d_z\}$ [2]. We

assume that the energy shifts due to higher partial waves are negligible in comparison to those of the s -wave. This tends to be true for ultracold collisions because the centrifugal barrier heights are large compared to the collision energy. We also neglect inelastic losses, that is, the imaginary part of the scattering length is much smaller than the real part [25].

Since spherical symmetry is broken by the anisotropic potential, \hat{L}^2 does not commute with the Hamiltonian. Consequently, partial waves with the same parity with respect to l are coupled. While the projection \hat{L}_z of angular momentum on the z -axis does commute with the Hamiltonian, only its $m_l = 0$ eigenstates are affected by s -wave scattering. Thus we only compute the energies of even partial wave, $m_l = 0$ states. We do not consider odd partial waves, should they be present for distinguishable bosons, because they have negligible energy shifts in the limit of very low collision energy.

III. METHOD OF EIGENVALUE SOLUTION AND SELF-CONSISTENT ENERGIES

We need to solve the eigenvalue problem for the Hamiltonian Eq. (4) self-consistently, because of the energy-dependent scattering length in the pseudopotential term. As in Ref. [2], this is done in two steps. We first obtain the eigenvalues $E_i(a/d, A)/\hbar\omega$ in scaled trap energy units for fixed values of A and the energy-independent scaled scattering length a/d . The self-consistent energy eigenvalues for an actual system with $a_{\text{eff}}(E)$ from Eq. (10) are then found graphically, for a given A , by superposing a plot of $E_i(a/d, A)$ as a function of a/d and a plot of $a_{\text{eff}}(E)/d$, with E as the ordinate and a_{eff}/d as the abscissa (cf. Fig. 1 and Fig 2 of [2]). The points where the curves intersect determine the self-consistent energies.

In the rest of this section we focus on obtaining $E_i(a/d, A)$, since $a_{\text{eff}}(E)$ can be found from a standard free-space scattering calculation. We use the partial wave expansion of the wavefunction, and expand each partial wave, with the exception of s -waves, in *isotropic* harmonic oscillator eigenfunctions of frequency ω . For the s -wave part, we use the analytic eigenfunctions of the isotropic harmonic oscillator with a Fermi pseudopotential proportional to scattering length a [16]. These automatically incorporate the singular nature of the wavefunction at the origin. Since $m_l = 0$ we can set the spherical coordinate $\phi = 0$, and consequently we write

$$\psi(r, \theta; a) = \sum_n c_{n0} Q_n(r; a) Y_{00}(\theta, 0) + \sum_n \sum_{l>0} c_{nl} R_{nl}(r) Y_{l0}(\theta, 0) \quad (11)$$

$$Q_n(r; a) = \frac{2a}{\sqrt{\pi}d^2} \sqrt{\frac{\partial \nu_n}{\partial a}} \Gamma(-\nu_n) U\left(-\nu_n, \frac{3}{2}; \frac{r^2}{d^2}\right) e^{-\frac{r^2}{2a^2}} \quad (12)$$

$$R_{nl}(r) = \left[\frac{2(n!)}{\Gamma(n+l+\frac{3}{2})} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{r}{d} \right)^{\frac{l+3}{4}} L_n^{(l+\frac{1}{2})} \left(\frac{r^2}{d^2} \right) e^{-\frac{r^2}{2a^2}} \quad (13)$$

where the summations are over all nonnegative integers n and even $l > 0$. Here U is the (second) Kummer confluent hypergeometric function, $L_n^{(l+\frac{1}{2})}$ are the Laguerre polynomials, and Γ is the Gamma function [26]. The nonintegral s -wave quantum numbers ν_n for an isotropic trap are determined by

$$\frac{a}{d} = \frac{1}{2} \tan \pi \nu_n \frac{\Gamma(\nu_n + 1)}{\Gamma(\nu_n + \frac{3}{2})}. \quad (14)$$

This equation also is used in the calculation of the derivative in Eq. (12).

We need the Hamiltonian matrix elements in the basis used in Eq. (11). The isotropic part of the Hamiltonian Eq. (4) gives only diagonal matrix elements:

$$H_{nl;nl}^{(0)} = \left(2n + l + \frac{3}{2} \right) \hbar\omega \quad (15)$$

for $l > 0$. Only the s -wave diagonal matrix elements,

$$H_{n0;n0}^{(0)} = \left(2\nu_n + \frac{3}{2} \right) \hbar\omega, \quad (16)$$

are affected at low energy by atom-atom interactions proportional to the scattering length. The anisotropic part of the Hamiltonian, Eq. (4) contributes both diagonal and off-diagonal matrix elements:

$$H_{n'l';n'l'}^{(1)} = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \mu\omega^2 \Lambda \langle n, l | r^2 Y_{20}(\theta, 0) | n', l' \rangle \quad (17)$$

for all principal quantum numbers n, n' and even partial waves l, l' . The derivation of these matrix elements is given in the Appendix. The diagonalization of the Hamiltonian matrix is straightforward with sparse matrix eigenvalue routines. For the most extreme anisotropies considered in this paper (as small as 0.01 and as large as 100), we required a maximum $l = 600$ and a maximum $n = 600$ to compute the lowest few eigenvalues for all values of scattering length. We have checked that the correct solutions are approached as $A \rightarrow 1$.

IV. QUASI-ONE-DIMENSIONAL TRAP

We have found solutions in the quasi-one-dimensional regime $A \ll 1$. Figure 1 shows $E_i(a/d, A = 0.01)$ versus a/d . The figure also shows the eigenvalues $E_i^{1D}(a/d)$ for a purely one-dimensional model, corresponding to interaction via a delta function in z and trapping along z only. Following Ref. [16], the eigenvalues are

$$E_i^{1D} = \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{A^2}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[1 + A \left(2\nu_i^{1D} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \hbar\omega \quad (18)$$

FIG. 1: Energy eigenvalues versus scattering length at $A = 0.01$ from Fermi-pseudopotential (solid line) and one-dimensional scattering theory (dashed line). ($\nu = \omega/2\pi$).

FIG. 2: Wavefunction $r\psi(x, 0, z)$ in Cartesian coordinates $x = r \sin \theta, y = 0, z = r \cos \theta$, corresponding to second lowest energy eigenvalue for $A = 0.01$ and $a/d = -25$. (b) is a close up of (a). All lengths are expressed in trap units of d and ψ in units of $d^{-3/2}$.

where the ν_i^{1D} satisfy

$$\tan \pi \nu_i^{1D} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_i^{1D} + 1)}{\Gamma(\nu_i^{1D} + \frac{1}{2})} = g^{1D}. \quad (19)$$

The one-dimensional interaction, $\hbar\omega g^{1D} \delta(z/d)$, is related to the three-dimensional scattering length through [12]

$$g^{1D} = \frac{\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{A^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \frac{a}{d}}{1 - 1.4603 \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(1 + \frac{A^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \frac{a}{d}}. \quad (20)$$

Our eigenvalues agree well with those from the one-dimensional model for $E > 0.8\hbar\omega$. To get this agreement, it is crucial to include the renormalization in the denominator of Eq. (20). The levels for $E > 1.23\hbar\omega$ represent trap levels aligned along the weak trapping direction with spacing about $2\hbar\omega_z = 0.024\hbar\omega$. In Fig. 1, there is no difference within our numerical accuracy between our lowest three trap levels and those from the one-dimensional model maximum energy difference, while the difference for the highest trap level shown is $0.002\hbar\omega$. The eigenvalues for large positive or negative scattering length approach the same asymptotic values. The lowest energy state is not predicted accurately by the one-dimensional model; we discuss this special state further in Sec. VI.

The wavefunction $r\psi(x = r \sin \theta, y = 0, z = r \cos \theta)$, corresponding to the second lowest energy, with $A = 0.01$ and $a/d = -25$, is plotted in Fig. 2. In Fig. 2(a) the one dimensional nature of the wavefunction is apparent on a scale large compared with d . The variation in x is approximately Gaussian, while scattering results in the dip along the line $z = 0$. A close-up of the wavefunction in Fig. 2(b) reveals how the scattering crosses over to a isotropic three-dimensional character at short interatomic distance. The function $r\psi$ is finite at the origin as a consequence of the pseudopotential scattering.

We have compared some of our results to a recent diffusion quantum Monte-Carlo study on the ground state of interacting bosons in elongated traps [27]. Our lowest trap state agrees with the ground state of that method to within one percent for anisotropies in the range $1 \geq A \geq 0.01$ for a *fixed* positive value of the scattering length, even though that study assumed a hard-core potential of size a .

FIG. 3: Energy eigenvalues versus scattering length at $A = 100$ from Fermi-pseudopotential (solid line) and two-dimensional scattering theory (dashed line). ($\nu = \omega/2\pi$)

V. QUASI-TWO-DIMENSIONAL TRAP

We have also computed solutions in the quasi-two-dimensional regime, $A \gg 1$. Figure 3 shows $E_i(a/d, A = 100)$ versus a/d . The figure also shows the eigenvalues $E_i^{2D}(a/d)$ for a purely two-dimensional model, corresponding to interaction via zero-range two-dimensional scattering and trapping in the x, y -plane only. Again following [16], the eigenvalues of a two-dimensional trap are

$$E_i^{2D} = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{A^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[\frac{A}{2} + 2\nu_i^{2D} + 1\right] \hbar\omega, \quad (21)$$

where the ν_i^{2D} satisfy

$$\Psi(-\nu_i^{2D}) = \frac{1}{g^{2D}} \quad (22)$$

and Ψ is the digamma function [26]. The two-dimensional scattering is mediated by an interaction strength related to the three-dimensional scattering length through

$$g^{2D} = \frac{\left(\frac{3}{2\pi^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} A^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{A^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \frac{a}{d}}{1 + \left(\frac{3}{2\pi^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \ln\left(\frac{0.915A}{4\pi}\right) A^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{A^2}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \frac{a}{d}}. \quad (23)$$

This expression for g^{2D} is derived by simple algebra from equations in Ref. [19].

Our eigenvalues agree well with this model for $E > 0.8\hbar\omega$. To obtain this agreement it is crucial to include the renormalization in the denominator of Eq. (23). The trap levels above $E \approx 0.9\hbar\omega$ are spaced by about $2\hbar\omega_{\perp} = 0.03462\hbar\omega_{\perp}$. In Fig. 3, the difference between our lowest trap level and that from the two-dimensional model is $0.0015\hbar\omega$ at $a/d = \pm 20$; the difference for the highest trap level shown is $0.002\hbar\omega$ at the same values of scattering length. The eigenvalues for large positive or negative scattering length approach the same asymptotic values. Again we note the exception that the lowest energy state is not predicted well by the renormalized two-dimensional model (see Sec. VI). A feature of the two-dimensional physics seen in Fig. 3 is that for $|a| \ll d$, all eigenvalue curves except the lowest have nearly the same slope.

A sample wavefunction $r\psi(x = r \sin \theta, y = 0, z = r \cos \theta)$, corresponding to the second lowest energy, at $A = 100$ and $a/d = -25$, is plotted in Fig. 4. (Note that the x and z axes are interchanged from Fig. 2.) The two-dimensional nature of the physics is immediately apparent on a scale large compared with d . The variation in z is approximately Gaussian, with a dip along $x = 0$. The

FIG. 4: Wavefunction $r\psi$ in Cartesian coordinates $x = r \sin \theta, y = 0, z = r \cos \theta$, corresponding to second lowest energy eigenvalue for $A = 100$ and $a/d = -25$. (b) is a close up of (a). All units are as in Fig. 2.

FIG. 5: Wavefunction $r\psi$ in Cartesian coordinates $x = r \sin \theta, y = 0, z = r \cos \theta$, corresponding to lowest energy eigenvalue for $A = 0.01$ and $a/d = -25$. All units are as in Fig. 2.

close-up Fig. 4(b) reveals how the scattering crosses over to a isotropic three-dimensional character at short interatomic distance, as in the quasi-one-dimensional case.

VI. TRAP-INDUCED BOUND STATE

Curiously, for large magnitudes of the scattering length, the lowest energy eigenvalue appears near $\hbar\omega/2$ for all values of trap anisotropy. This behavior can be explained by examining the wavefunctions of these states plotted in Figs. 5 and 6, at $a = -25$, for $A = 0.01$ and 100 respectively. Both wavefunctions are more nearly isotropic than those corresponding to higher levels at the same parameters (see Figs. 2 and 4), and their extent is roughly the mean trap length scale d . Similar wavefunctions are obtained for large positive scattering length.

The energy of the lowest state is plotted in Fig. 7 for $a/d = \pm 100$ as a function of anisotropy. The shape of this curve can be understood from a perturbative picture in the anisotropic interaction $H^{(1)}$, defined in Eq. (7). To zeroth-order in this picture the state is the lowest level of the *isotropic* trap of frequency ω and a pseudopotential with scattering length a . (Recall that for an isotropic trap with $a \rightarrow -\infty$ the lowest energy is $\hbar\omega/2$.) There is no first-order correction in $H^{(1)}$, while to second-order the energy gets a small correction proportional to Λ^2 . Indeed, we find that a quadratic fit in Λ at $a/d = -100$ results in $E_0/\hbar\omega = 0.5054 - 0.0562\Lambda^2$; compare with the zeroth-order energy $0.5056\hbar\omega$ for the lowest state in an isotropic trap at the same scattering length. Similarly, at $a/d = 100$ we find $E_0/\hbar\omega = 0.4941 - 0.0549\Lambda^2$ compared with the zeroth-order energy $0.4943\hbar\omega$ in the isotropic case.

When neglecting the pseudopotential, the energy of the lowest state is $E(a=0)/\hbar\omega = (1+A/2)/\sqrt{2/3 + A^2/3} > \sqrt{3}/2$, so we should properly consider a state to be bound when its energy is lower than this. Thus we denote such a state the *trap-induced bound state*. One can also think of it as an artificial molecule with an extent given roughly by

FIG. 6: Wavefunction $r\psi$ in Cartesian coordinates $x = r \sin \theta, y = 0, z = r \cos \theta$, corresponding to lowest energy eigenvalue for $A = 100$ and $a/d = -25$. All units are as in Fig. 2.

FIG. 7: Lowest-energy eigenvalue versus trap anisotropy A (logarithmic scale) at $a/d = -100$ (triangles) and $a/d = 100$ (squares). Fits up to first order in Λ^2 for $a/d = -100$ (solid line) and $a/d = 100$ (dashed line) are shown; see text for coefficients of fits. The fits verify that the wavefunction is nearly isotropic for all A . ($\nu = \omega/2\pi$)

FIG. 8: Energy eigenvalues versus magnetic field B for two Na atoms in the lowest hyperfine level in a axisymmetric trap with $\nu = \omega/2\pi = 500\text{kHz}$ and anisotropy $A = 0.01$. The dashed line shows the energy of the lowest trap level when the interatomic interaction is neglected.

the size of the tightest trap dimension. As the scattering length approaches zero from the positive side, we recover the usual molecular bound state with an energy below zero.

VII. FESHBACH RESONANCE IN QUASI-ONE-DIMENSIONAL TRAP

One possible way of varying the atomic interaction strengths experimentally is through the use of a tunable Feshbach resonance state. Consequently we describe a quasi-one-dimensional magnetically tunable Feshbach resonance by using the self-consistent energy method with the eigenvalues of Fig. 1. We consider two Na atoms in their lowest hyperfine levels, for which an *s*-wave Feshbach resonance occurs near 90.9 mT [28, 29, 30]. The scattering length is highly energy- and magnetic-field-dependent near the resonance. We use the effective scattering length from a close-coupling calculation, as described in Ref. [2, 30]. The trap frequencies are taken to be $\omega_{\perp}/2\pi = 612\text{kHz}$, $\omega_z/2\pi = 6.12\text{kHz}$, so the trap anisotropy is $A = 0.01$ and $\omega/2\pi = 500\text{kHz}$. Using the procedure outlined at the beginning of Sec. III, we predict the eigenvalues as a function of applied magnetic field near the resonance in Fig. 8. As the magnetic field is tuned through resonance, the lowest state goes continuously from a molecular state with $E < 0$, to the trap-induced bound state $E \approx \hbar\omega/2$, to the lowest quasi-one-dimensional trap state at $E \approx \sqrt{3/2}\hbar\omega \approx 1.23\hbar\omega$. For the trap frequencies chosen here one can change from a molecular bound state to a trap state by tuning the magnetic field 0.01 mT. The trap states are smoothly shifted up by $2\hbar\omega_z$ as the magnetic field is increased.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We have argued that an energy-dependent pseudopotential approach may be used to calculate eigenvalues of two ultracold atoms colliding in an axisymmetric harmonic trap. Furthermore, we have numerically solved for the eigenvalues of the axisymmetric trap with an *s*-wave

pseudopotential interaction proportional to a scattering length. These results can be considered a generalization of the isotropic trap case previously solved [2, 16]. Our results show that one- and two- dimensional interaction regimes can be reached, but that the interactions become renormalized by the tight trapping potential when the magnitude of the effective scattering length is large compared with a mean trap length. Remarkably, in the case of scattering length of large magnitude, we find a nearly isotropic state with energy near $\hbar\omega/2$ for all values of trap anisotropy. This is a trap-induced bound state. The size of state is controllable by the tightest trap frequency. We show by an example that this state can be reached with the current techniques of magnetically tunable Feshbach resonance applied to atoms in an optical lattice.

The numerical techniques used in this article may also be useful when the interatomic interaction becomes sufficiently long-range compared with the tightest trap direction or is anisotropic such that the s -wave pseudopotential approach becomes insufficient. This is of importance, for example, for dipole-dipole interactions [3, 31, 32]. The possibility of manipulating shape resonances (such as the d -wave resonance in Na collisions) with the trap should not be overlooked. The effective-scattering-length model and partial wave expansion in our numerical technique should also solve the eigenvalue problem for atoms colliding in separated traps, as can occur in a state-dependent optical lattice. This is particularly important for the proposals on quantum computing with neutral atoms. We are continuing work in this area.

Acknowledgments

Discussions with M. Olshanii and B. Gao were helpful. We thank D. Blume for making available her results on two-body ground state energies. ELB was supported from the National Research Council. ET and PSJ acknowledge support from the Office of Naval Research.

Appendix: Matrix elements of anisotropic potential

In this appendix we evaluate the matrix elements of the anisotropic potential term $H_{nl;n'l'}^{(1)}$ in the basis of partial waves, isotropic harmonic oscillator functions and the irregular s -wave oscillator eigenfunctions.

The partial wave expansion applied to the angle-dependent factor of the Hamiltonian is evaluated with the three-spherical-harmonic formula,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{ll'} &= \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \int d\Omega Y_{l'0}^*(\Omega) Y_{20}(\Omega) Y_{l0}(\Omega) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2l+1}{2l'+1}} \langle 2l; 00 | 2l; l'0 \rangle^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Evaluation of the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient

$\langle 2l; 00 | 2l; l'0 \rangle$ shows that

$$I_{ll} = \frac{l(l+1)}{(2l-3)(2l+3)} \quad (25)$$

$$I_{l,l+2} = I_{l+2,l} = \frac{3(l+1)(l+2)}{2(2l+3)\sqrt{(2l+1)(2l+5)}} \quad (26)$$

while all other angular matrix elements are zero.

This leaves the radial factor of the matrix element to be computed. Throughout the remainder of the appendix kets refer to the radial part of the basis functions only, so that for (cf. Eqs. (12) and (13))

$$\langle r | nl \rangle = R_{nl}(r) \quad (27)$$

$$\langle r | n0 \rangle = Q_n(r; a). \quad (28)$$

In this notation

$$H_{nl;n'l'}^{(1)} = \mu\omega^2 \Delta I_{ll'} \langle nl | r^2 | n'l' \rangle. \quad (29)$$

The analytic evaluation of the radial matrix elements $\langle nl | r^2 | n'l' \rangle$ is most conveniently carried out using n - and l -ladder operators. From the factorization method applied to the radial Schrödinger equation [33], the n -raising and n -lowering operators are

$$\hat{b}_{nl}^{\pm} = \pm r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \pm \frac{1}{2} - r^2 + 2n + l + \frac{1}{2} \quad (30)$$

$$\hat{b}_{nl}^- |nl\rangle = \sqrt{2n(2n+2l+1)} |n-1, l\rangle \quad (31)$$

$$\hat{b}_{nl}^+ |n-1, l\rangle = \sqrt{2n(2n+2l+1)} |nl\rangle, \quad (32)$$

while the l -raising operator is

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_l^+ = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + r - \frac{l}{r} \quad (33)$$

such that

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_l^+ |nl\rangle = -2\sqrt{n} |n-1, l+1\rangle. \quad (34)$$

(Note that these operators are applied to the normalized radial eigenfunctions.)

For $l = l' > 0$, we use the fact that

$$r^2 = 2n + l + \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{b}_{n+1,l}^+ - \frac{1}{2} \hat{b}_{n,l}^- \quad (35)$$

and orthonormality to find

$$\langle nl | r^2 | nl \rangle = 2n + l + \frac{3}{2} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n+1, l | r^2 | nl \rangle &= \langle nl | r^2 | n+1, l \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2(n+1)(2n+2l+3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

with all other equal- l matrix elements vanishing. (We recognize Eq. (36) as a consequence of the quantum virial theorem for the isotropic harmonic oscillator.)

For $l' = l + 2$ (but $l \neq 0$), we begin with

$$\langle nl|r^2|n', l+2\rangle = \frac{\langle nl|r^2\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{l+1}^+\hat{\mathcal{L}}_l^+|n'+2, l\rangle}{4\sqrt{(n'+1)(n'+2)}} \quad (38)$$

and use the operator identity

$$r^2\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{l+1}^+\hat{\mathcal{L}}_l^+ = \left[-\hat{b}_{n+1, l}^- + 2(n+1) + 2 \right] \times \left[-\hat{b}_{n+2, l}^- + 2(n+2) \right] \quad (39)$$

to obtain the non-vanishing matrix elements

$$\langle nl|r^2|n, l+2\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2n+2l+3)(2n+2l+5)} \quad (40)$$

$$\langle n+1, l|r^2|n, l+2\rangle = -\sqrt{2(n+1)(2n+2l+5)} \quad (41)$$

$$\langle n+2, l|r^2|n, l+2\rangle = \sqrt{(n+1)(n+2)}. \quad (42)$$

For the special case of $l = 0$, we use the expansion of the irregular solutions in terms of $|nl\rangle$ [16] and apply the above matrix elements. This results in

$$\langle n0|r^2|n'2\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2\Gamma(n'+\frac{7}{2})}{\pi\Gamma(n'+1)}} a \sqrt{\frac{\partial\nu_n}{\partial a}} \times \left(\frac{1}{n'-\nu_n} - \frac{2}{n'+1-\nu_n} + \frac{1}{n'+2-\nu_n} \right). \quad (43)$$

(The matrix elements $\langle n0|r^2|n'0\rangle$ are not needed since $I_{00} = 0$.)

-
- [1] M. Greiner *et al.*, Nature **415**, 39 (2002).
[2] E. L. Bolda, E. Tiesinga, and P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 013403 (2002).
[3] G. K. Brennen, C. M. Caves, P. S. Jessen, and I. H. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1060 (1999).
[4] D. Jaksch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1975 (1999).
[5] C. Orzel *et al.*, Science **291**, 2386 (2001).
[6] J. HeckerDenschlag *et al.*, J. Phys. B **35**, 3095 (2002).
[7] A. Görlitz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 130402 (2001).
[8] K. Bongs *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 031602 (2001).
[9] J. H. Thywissen *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. D **7**, 361 (1999).
[10] S. Dettmer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 160406 (2001).
[11] F. Schreck *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 080403 (2001).
[12] M. Olshanii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 938 (1998).
[13] V. Dunjko, V. Lorent, and M. Olshanii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5413 (2001).
[14] B. Paredes, P. Fedichev, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 010402 (2001).
[15] H. T. C. Stoof and M. Bijlsma, Phys. Rev. E **47**, 939 (1993).
[16] T. Busch, B.-G. Englert, K. Rzȃżewski, and M. Wilkens, Foundations of Physics **28**, 549 (1998).
[17] M. Block and M. Holthaus, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052102 (2002).
[18] D. Blume and C. H. Greene, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 043613 (2002).
[19] D. S. Petrov and G. V. Shlyapnikov, Phys. Rev. A. **64**, 012706 (2001).
[20] K. I. Petsas, A. B. Coates, and G. Grynberg, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 5173 (1994).
[21] G. F. Gribakin and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 546 (1993).
[22] J. Weiner, V. S. Bagnato, S. Zilio, and P. S. Julienne, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1 (1999).
[23] C. J. Williams *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 4427 (1999).
[24] K. Huang and C. N. Yang, Physical Review **105**, 767 (1957).
[25] E. Tiesinga, C. J. Williams, F. H. Mies, and P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 063416 (2000).
[26] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables* (U.S. Govt. Print. Off., Washington, 1972).
[27] D. Blume, , cond-mat/0206244.
[28] S. Inouye *et al.*, Nature **392**, 151 (1998).
[29] F. A. van Abeelen and B. J. Verhaar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1550 (1999).
[30] F. H. Mies, E. Tiesinga, and P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 022721 (2000).
[31] K. Góral, L. Santos, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 170406 (2002).
[32] A. Derevianko, cond-mat/0212597 (2002).
[33] L. Infeld and T. E. Hull, Rev. Mod. Phys. **23**, 2168 (1951).

This figure "Fig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0304001v1>

This figure "Fig2a+b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0304001v1>

This figure "Fig3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0304001v1>

This figure "Fig4a+b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0304001v1>

This figure "Fig5.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0304001v1>

This figure "Fig6.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0304001v1>



