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Abstract. Josephson junctions (JJs) and junction arrays are well-studied devices in superconductivity. With external magnetic fields one can modulate the phase in a long junction and create traveling, solitonic waves of magnetic flux, called fluxons. Today, it is also possible to devise two different types of junctions: depending on the sign of the critical current density $j_c \gtrless 0$, they are called $0$- or $\pi$-junctions. In turn, a $0-\pi$ junction is formed by joining two of these junctions. As a result, one obtains a pinned Josephson vortex of fractional magnetic flux, at the $0-\pi$ boundary. Here, we analyze this arrangement of superconducting junctions in the context of an atomic bosonic quantum gas, where two-state atoms in a double well trap are coupled in an analogous fashion. There, an all-optical $0-\pi$ JJ is created by the phase of a complex valued Rabi frequency and we derive a discrete four-mode model for this situation, which qualitatively resembles a semifluxon.
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1. Introduction

During the past two decades, the field of cold atomic gases has come a long way starting from almost lossless trapping and cooling techniques [1] to reaching quantum degeneracy of bosons and fermions [2]. Many phenomena that are the hallmarks of condensed matter physics, whether in superfluid or superconducting materials [3], are revisited within this novel context. Due to the remarkable ease with which it is possible to isolate the key mechanisms from rogue processes, one can clearly identify phase transitions, for example, Bose–Einstein condensation (BEC), the Mott phase transition or the BEC–BCS crossover. Today however, degenerate gases are still at a disadvantage if we consider robustness, portability or the ability for mass production compared to solid-state devices, which is a great achievement of the semiconductor industry. Strong attempts to miniaturize cold gas experiments ([4]; [5] and references therein) and to make them portable [6]–[9] are currently under way in many laboratories.

Due to the great importance and practical relevance of the Josephson effect to superconducting systems [10]–[12], it also received immediate attention after the first realization of BECs [13]–[26] and superfluid atomic fermions [27], more recently. In particular, the combination of optical lattices with ultracold gases [28, 29] has boosted the possibilities of investigating junction arrays experimentally. Remarkably, even the absence of phase-coherence between neighboring sites can lead to interference as demonstrated in [30]. The possibility of studying atomic Josephson vortices in the mean field description was raised first in connection with the sine-Gordon equation [31, 32].

In the present paper, we will report on such a transfer of concepts from a superconducting device [33], i.e. in various realizations of Josephson junction (JJ) arrays and their unusual state properties of traveling (fluxons) and pinned (semifluxons) magnetic flux quanta, to an analogous set-up for neutral bosonic atoms in a trap. In particular, we will investigate an all-optical 0–π JJ that can be created with a jumping phase of an optical laser.

This paper is organized as follows: in section 2, we give a brief review of the current status of the superconductor physics of JJs. In particular, we refer to the most relevant publications in this thriving field of fluxon and semifluxon physics; in section 3, we discuss a similar set-up, which allows us to find a pinned semifluxon in an atomic 0–π JJ and we compare the results. Finally, we discuss further open questions in section 4.
2. Fluxons and semifluxons in superconductivity

The Josephson effect is a well-established phenomenon in solid-state physics. A JJ consists of two weakly coupled superconducting condensates. JJs are usually fabricated artificially using low- or high-$T_c$ superconducting electrodes separated by a thin insulating (tunnel), normal metal, or some other (exotic) barrier. JJs can also be present intrinsically in an anisotropic layered high-$T_c$ superconductor such as $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{Ca}_1\text{Cu}_2\text{O}_8$ \cite{34, 35}.

The dc Josephson effect (flow of current through a JJ without producing a voltage drop, i.e. without dissipation) is expressed using the first Josephson relation, which in the simplest case has the form

$$I_s = I_c \sin(\phi),$$

where $I_s$ is the supercurrent flowing through the junction, $I_c$ is the critical current, i.e. the maximum supercurrent which can pass through the JJ, and $\phi = \theta_2 - \theta_1$ is the difference between the phases of the quantum mechanical macroscopic wavefunctions $\psi_{1,2} = \sqrt{n_s}e^{i\theta_{1,2}}$ of the superconducting condensates in the electrodes.

Recent advances in physics and technology allow the fabrication and study of the so-called $\pi$-JJs—junctions which formally have negative critical current $I_c < 0$. This can be achieved by using a ferromagnetic barrier, i.e. in superconductor–ferromagnet–superconductor (SFS) \cite{36}–\cite{40} or superconductor–insulator–ferromagnet–superconductor (SIFS) \cite{41, 42} structures. One can also achieve the same effect using a barrier which effectively flips the spin of a tunneling electron, e.g. when the barrier is made of a ferromagnetic insulator \cite{43}, of a carbon nanotube \cite{44} or of a quantum dot created by gating a semiconducting nanowire \cite{45}.

The change in the sign of a critical current has far-reaching consequences. For example, analyze the Josephson energy (potential energy related to the supercurrent flow). In a conventional JJ with $I_c > 0$, $U(\phi) = E_J(1 - \cos \phi)$ and has a minimum at $\phi = 0 + 2\pi n$ (the ground state), where $E_J = \Phi_0 I_c / 2\pi$ is the Josephson energy. If $I_c < 0$, we define $E_J = |\Phi_0 I_c| / 2\pi > 0$ and $U(\phi) = E_J(1 + \cos \phi)$. Obviously, the minimum of energy is reached for $\phi = \pi + 2\pi n$. Thus, in the ground state (the JJ is not connected to a current source, no current flows through it), the phase drop across a conventional JJ with $I_c > 0$ is $\phi = 0 + 2\pi n$, while for a junction with $I_c < 0$ it is $\phi = \pi + 2\pi n$. Therefore, one speaks about ‘0-JJs’ and ‘$\pi$-JJs’.

Further, connecting the two superconducting electrodes of a $\pi$-JJ by a not very small inductor $L$ (superconducting wire), the supercurrent $\propto \pi / L$ will start circulating in the loop. Note that this supercurrent is spontaneous, i.e. it appears by itself, and has a direction randomly chosen between clockwise and counterclockwise \cite{46}. The magnetic flux created by this supercurrent inside the loop is equal to $\Phi_0 / 2$, where $\Phi_0 = h / 2e \approx 2.07 \times 10^{-15}$ Wb is the magnetic flux quantum. Thus, the $\pi$-JJ works as a phase battery. This phase battery will work as described, supplying a supercurrent through the loop with the inductor, provided the inductance $L \gg \Phi_0 / I_c$. If the inductance $L$ is not that large, the battery will be overloaded, providing a smaller phase drop and supporting smaller current. For very small inductance the battery will stop working completely.
Figure 1. Sketch of a 0–π JJ and profiles of (a) the phase $\phi(x)$, (b) the magnetic field $\propto d\phi(x)/dx$ and (c) the supercurrent density $j_s(x) \propto \sin \phi(x)$ corresponding to a semifluxon (blue/light gray) and antisemifluxon (pink/dark gray). The gray shading in subplot (a) represents the Josephson (potential) energies of equations (2) and (3), where dark is low and light means high values.

Similar effects can be observed in a π dc superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID; one 0-JJ, one π-JJ and an inductor $L$ connected in series and closed in a loop) or in 0–π JJ. Let us focus on the latter case.

Consider a long (along $x$) Josephson junction (LJJ) one half of which at $x < 0$ has the properties of a 0-JJ (critical current density $j_c > 0$) and the other half at $x > 0$ has the properties of a π-JJ (critical current density $j_c < 0$). Long means that the length is much larger than the so-called Josephson length $\lambda_J$, which characterizes the size of a Josephson vortex; typically $\lambda_J \sim 10$–20 $\mu$m. What will be the ground state of such a 0–π LJJ? It turns out that if the junction is long enough (formally infinitely long), then far away from the 0–π boundary situated at $x = 0$, i.e. at $x \to \pm\infty$, the phase $\phi$ will have the values 0 or $\pm \pi$ (we omit $2\pi n$ here), while in the vicinity of the 0–π boundary the phase $\phi(x)$ smoothly changes from $\phi(-\infty) = 0$ to $\phi(+\infty) = \pm \pi$, see figure 1(a). The exact profile can be derived analytically [33, 47, 48]. Since
the phase bends, the local magnetic field $H \propto d\phi/dx$ will be localized in the vicinity of the $0–\pi$ boundary and carry the total flux equal to $\pm \Phi_0/2$, see figure 1(b). The sign depends on whether the phase bends from $\phi(-\infty) = 0$ to $\phi(+\infty) = +\pi$ or to $\phi(+\infty) = -\pi$. Thus, such an object is called a semifluxon or an antifluxon. If one analyzes the Josephson supercurrent density flowing through the barrier $j_s(x) = j_c(x) \sin \phi(x)$, one can see in figure 1(c) that the supercurrent has different directions on different sides of the $0–\pi$ boundary. Since we do not apply any external current, the flow of current should close in the top and bottom electrodes, i.e. the supercurrent circulates (counter)clockwise in the case of (anti)semifluxon. Thus, a semifluxon is a Josephson vortex of supercurrent. It is pinned at the $0–\pi$ boundary and has two degenerate ground states with the localized magnetic field carrying the flux $\pm \Phi_0/2$.

Semifluxons in various types of JJs have been actively investigated during the last few years. In fact, the first experiments became possible because of a deeper understanding of the symmetry of the superconducting order parameter in cuprate superconductors. This order parameter with so-called d-wave symmetry is realized in anisotropic superconductors, such as YBa$_2$Cu$_3$O$_7$ or Nd$_{2−x}$Ce$_x$CuO$_4$. It allowed the fabrication of $0–\pi$ grain boundary LJJs [49, 50] and, later, more controllable d-wave/s-wave ramp zigzag JJs [51, 52] and the ability to directly see and manipulate semifluxons using a SQUID microscope [53, 54].

Semifluxons are very interesting nonlinear objects: they can form a variety of ground states [55]–[58], may flip [49, 53] emitting a fluxon [57, 59, 60], or be rearranged [61] by a bias current. Huge arrays of semifluxons were realized [53] and predicted to behave as tunable photonic crystals [62]. Semifluxons are also promising candidates for storage devices in the classical or quantum domain and can be used to build qubits [63] as they behave like macroscopic spin $1/2$ particles.

Now, an interesting question arises: can one realize $\pi$ or even $0–\pi$ JJs in an atomic BEC? In the latter case, the degenerate ground state corresponding to a semifluxon should have a nontrivial spatial phase profile and semifluxon physics can also be studied using BEC implementation.

3. Semifluxons in BECs

Here, we will address this question and examine a configuration where the two-state atoms are trapped in a quasi-one-dimensional (1D) cigar-shaped trap with an additional superimposed double-well potential in the longitudinal direction. The spatial localization of the two-state atoms inside the double-well potential leads to two internal atomic JJs that are driven via an optical, complex valued ‘$0–\pi$’ laser field and they are motionally connected via tunneling.

First, we will present details of the model and introduce the Hamiltonian of the system. Then, we will examine the classical limit of the field theory and study the ground state of the Gross–Pitaevskii equation. Finally, we will exploit the fact that the spatial wavefunctions are localized inside a deep double well and study a simple four-mode quantum model derived from a Wannier basis state representation.

3.1. $0–\pi$-junction in a BEC

To model the $0–\pi$ -junction [31, 32] in a BEC, we are guided by the condensed matter physics set-up depicted in figure 2 and replace the two superconductors by an atomic two-level BEC in a cigar-shaped trap. The two states of the atom, i.e. the excited state $|e\rangle$ and ground state
Figure 2. Analogy of a 0–π JJ in a superconductor (a) with an atomic two-level BEC (b) in a double well trap $V(x)$ with a position dependent Rabi frequency $\Omega_0(x)$. The excited atomic level $|e\rangle$ is separated from the ground level $|g\rangle$ by the detuning $2\delta$.

$|g\rangle$, couple via a position-dependent Rabi frequency $\Omega_0(x)$, which exhibits a phase jump at the origin of the $x$-axes

$$\Omega_0(x) = \begin{cases} 
\Omega_0, & x < 0, \\
-\Omega_0, & x \geq 0.
\end{cases} \quad (4)$$

In this quasi-1D scenario, we will represent the two-state atoms by a spinorial bosonic quantum field $\hat{\Psi}$, which satisfies the commutator relation

$$[\hat{\Psi}(x), \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(y)] = \mathbb{I} \delta(x - y). \quad (5)$$

This field can be decomposed in any complete single particle basis $|\sigma, l\rangle$, which resolves the spatial extent of the field and the internal structure of the atoms, i.e.

$$\hat{\Psi} = \sum_{\sigma = \{e, g\}} \sum_{l = 0}^{\infty} |\sigma, l\rangle \hat{a}_{\sigma,l} \quad (6)$$

and we denote the corresponding discrete bosonic field amplitudes by $\hat{a}_{\sigma,l}$. Here, $\sigma$ characterizes the internal states by $(e, g)$ and the external motion in the double-well potential by a quantum label $l$. The dynamical evolution of the atomic field is governed by the following Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left[ -\partial_x^2 + V(x) + \left( \frac{\delta}{\Omega_0^2(x)} - \delta \right) \hat{\Psi}^\dagger(x) \hat{\Psi}(x) + g \hat{\Psi}_e^\dagger(x) \hat{\Psi}_e(x) \hat{\Psi}_e^\dagger(x) \hat{\Psi}_g(x) + g \hat{\Psi}_g^\dagger(x) \hat{\Psi}_g(x) \hat{\Psi}_g^\dagger(x) \hat{\Psi}_g(x) \right].$$

$\quad (7)$

Here, we use dimensionless units, in particular we have set $\hbar = 1$ and the mass of the atom $m = 1$. The energy consists of the single particle energy in a trap $V(x)$, which is identical for both species, the electric dipole interaction of the two-state atom $[64]$, as well as a generic collision energy proportional to the coupling constant $g = g_{ee} = g_{gg}$. To simplify the analysis, we have deliberately set the cross-component scattering length $g_{eg} = 0$. No unaccounted loss channels are present. Therefore, we have number conservation

$$[\hat{H}, \hat{N}] = 0, \quad (8)$$
as a symmetry. If we denote a generic state of the many-particle system in Fock space by

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \psi_n(t) |n = (n_0, n_1, \ldots)\rangle,$$

then one can obtain the dynamics of the system most generally from the Lagrangian formulation

$$\mathcal{L}[\psi_n(t), \dot{\psi}_n(t)] = \langle \psi(t) | i \partial_t - \hat{H} | \psi(t) \rangle. \quad (10)$$

In field theory, the canonical momentum is given by

$$\pi_n = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta \dot{\psi}_n} = i \psi^* \dot{\psi}_n.$$

From the Hamilton equation $\dot{\pi}_n = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta \psi_n}$, one recovers the conventional Schrödinger equation in Fock space

$$i \partial_t |\psi\rangle = \hat{H} |\psi\rangle. \quad (11)$$

The Lagrangian approach is obviously a central concept in the path integral formulation of quantum mechanics [65]. However, it is also of great utility in the approximate description of the dynamics if we connect it with concepts of classical mechanics as we will see in the following.

3.2. Spatially extended classical model: the Gross–Pitaevskii equation

The classical limit of the field equations [2] can be recovered quickly by approximating the state of the system by a coherent state

$$\hat{\Psi}_c(x) |\psi\rangle = \psi_c(x) |\psi\rangle.$$

Within this approximation, we obtain from the Lagrangian of equation (10) the two-component Gross–Pitaevskii equation $\psi = (\psi_e(x, t), \psi_g(x, t))^T$

$$i \partial_t \psi = \left[ -\partial^2_x + V(x) + \left( \frac{\delta + 2g|\psi_e|^2}{\Omega_0(x)} - \delta + 2g|\psi_g|^2 \right) \right] \psi. \quad (13)$$

For a macroscopically occupied field this equation models the spatial evolution of the coupled JJs very well [17]–[21], [23]–[25], [32].

3.3. Discrete quantum model: two coupled JJs

To gain more insight into the quantum properties of the ground state of the system [63], one can decompose the atomic field into its principal components and disregard small corrections. Recently, the use of Wannier basis states [66] was popularized in a seminal article of Jaksch et al [67] to derive a Bose–Hubbard model for atoms in optical lattices.

In our situation, we want to consider a double-well potential as the limiting case of a periodic lattice. While even and odd parity modes relate to delocalized Bloch states in a periodic system, left and right localized modes, i.e. $\varphi_0$ and right $\varphi_1$, resemble the Wannier basis. No particular emphasis is given to the shape of the double-well potential. Therefore, we simply construct even and odd parity Bloch states from displaced Gaussians. By a further orthogonal transformation, we have obtained the localized Wannier modes, which are depicted in figure 3.

With respect to these basis states, we can approximate the field with four modes

$$\hat{\Psi}_e(x) = \hat{g}_0 \varphi_0(x) + \hat{g}_1 \varphi_1(x) + \delta \hat{\Psi}_g,$$

$$\hat{\Psi}_g(x) = \hat{g}_0 \varphi_0(x) + \hat{g}_1 \varphi_1(x) + \delta \hat{\Psi}_g. \quad (15)$$
From even and odd parity modes of a double-well potential, one can construct the left $\varphi_0$ (solid line) and right $\varphi_1$ (dashed-dotted line) localized Wannier states of the system.

The four bosonic amplitudes $\{\hat{g}_0, \hat{e}_0, \hat{g}_1, \hat{e}_1\}$ satisfy the usual commutation relations and we will disregard the small corrections of order $\delta \Psi_\sigma$.

If this approximate field is substituted in the Hamiltonian, equation (7), we can exploit the orthogonality of the wavefunctions and obtain the two-body matrix elements $\varphi_{ijkl}$

$$\delta_{ij} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \, \varphi_i(x) \varphi_j(x), \quad \varphi_{ijkl} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \, \varphi_i(x) \varphi_j(x) \varphi_k(x) \varphi_l(x).$$

Out of the 16 combinations for $\varphi_{ijkl}$, we only retain the physically most relevant contributions and disregard others deliberately. This leads to the following model Hamiltonian for two coupled JJs:

$$\hat{H} = \Lambda (\hat{e}_0^\dagger \hat{e}_1 + \hat{e}_1^\dagger \hat{e}_0 + \hat{g}_0^\dagger \hat{g}_1 + \hat{g}_1^\dagger \hat{g}_0) + \delta (\hat{e}_0^\dagger \hat{e}_0 - \hat{g}_0^\dagger \hat{g}_0) + \delta (\hat{e}_1^\dagger \hat{e}_1 - \hat{g}_1^\dagger \hat{g}_1)$$

$$+ \Omega_0 (\hat{e}_0^\dagger \hat{g}_0 + \hat{g}_0^\dagger \hat{e}_0) + \Omega_1 (\hat{e}_1^\dagger \hat{g}_1 + \hat{g}_1^\dagger \hat{e}_1) + \Omega (\hat{g}_0^\dagger \hat{g}_0 \hat{e}_0 \hat{e}_0 + \hat{e}_0^\dagger \hat{e}_0 \hat{g}_0 \hat{g}_0 + \hat{g}_1^\dagger \hat{g}_1 \hat{e}_1 \hat{e}_1 + \hat{e}_1^\dagger \hat{e}_1 \hat{g}_1 \hat{g}_1),$$

where all coupling constants are implicitly rescaled by the corresponding single particle or two-body matrix elements and the new parameter $\Lambda$ measures the spatial hopping rate between the sites.

3.4. Fock-space representation of the four-mode model

In principle, it is possible to solve the four-mode Schrödinger equation in Fock space by projecting it on the $N$-particle sector

$$|\psi, N\rangle = \delta (\hat{N} - N) \sum_{\mathbf{n}=0}^{\infty} \psi_{\mathbf{n}} |\mathbf{n} = (n_0^e, n_0^g, n_1^e, n_1^g)\rangle.$$
boundaries. We have illustrated the finite support of the amplitude field $\psi_n$ in figure 4. It is a $(d-1)$-dimensional simplex embedded into a $d$-dimensional Fock space. The full analysis of this problem is an interesting problem in its own right and will be presented in a forthcoming publication.

Figure 4. A 3D simplex represents the four-mode Fock space for $N = 32$ particles. The axes are labeled in a generic lexicographical order $(n_0, n_1, n_2)$ and implicitly $n_4 = N - n_0 - n_1 - n_2$.

3.5. The classical limit of the four-mode model

It is not necessary to solve the four-mode problem in Fock space to understand the principal features of the equilibrium configuration. Thus, we will again resort to the classical approximation and use the number-symmetry broken coherent state approximation for the quantum state

$$|\psi\rangle = |\alpha\rangle = (e_0, g_0, e_1, g_1)^{\top}, \quad \hat{e}_i|\psi\rangle = e_i|\psi\rangle, \quad \hat{g}_i|\psi\rangle = g_i|\psi\rangle.$$  

The dynamics is simply obtained from the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \dot{\alpha}) = \langle \alpha | i\dot{\alpha} - \hat{H}|\alpha\rangle = i\alpha^\ast \alpha - \mathcal{H}(\alpha, \alpha^\ast) - \frac{i}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{N}(\alpha, \alpha^\ast),$$  

if we introduce the classical Hamilton functions $\mathcal{H}(\alpha, \alpha^\ast) = \langle \alpha | \hat{H}|\alpha\rangle$ and number expectation values $\mathcal{N}(\alpha, \alpha^\ast) = \langle \alpha | \hat{N}|\alpha\rangle$ as

$$\mathcal{H}(\alpha, \alpha^\ast) = \Lambda(e_0^\ast e_0 + e_1^\ast e_1 + g_0^\ast g_0 + g_1^\ast g_1) + \delta_0(|e_0|^2 - |g_0|^2) + \delta_1(|e_1|^2 - |g_1|^2)$$
$$+ \Omega_0(e_0^\ast g_0 + g_0^\ast e_0) + \Omega_1(e_1^\ast g_1 + g_1^\ast e_1) + g(|e_0|^4 + |g_0|^4 + |e_1|^4 + |g_1|^4),$$  

$$\mathcal{N}(\alpha, \alpha^\ast) = |e_0|^2 + |g_0|^2 + |e_1|^2 + |g_1|^2.$$  
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If the dynamical coordinate is $\alpha$, then we find the canonical momentum as

$$\pi_k = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\alpha}_k} = i\dot{\alpha}_k^e.$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

Consequently, variables and momenta obey the Poisson bracket $\{\alpha_j, \pi_k\} = \delta_{jk}$. By construction, number conservation is satisfied dynamically as

$$\frac{d}{dt} N = \{H, N\} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

and the Hamilton equations of motion for the coordinates read

$$\frac{d}{dt} \alpha = \{H, \alpha\} = -i\mathcal{K}\alpha,$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{pmatrix}
\delta_0 + 2g|\alpha_0|^2 & \Omega_0 & \Lambda & 0 \\
\Omega_0 & -\delta_0 + 2g|\alpha_1|^2 & 0 & \Lambda \\
\Lambda & 0 & \delta_1 + 2g|\alpha_2|^2 & \Omega_1 \\
0 & \Lambda & \Omega_1 & -\delta_1 + 2g|\alpha_3|^2
\end{pmatrix}.$$  

In classical mechanics, we can deliberately choose new coordinates and momenta to account for symmetries of the Hamiltonian. If a new variable of a canonical transformation matches a conserved quantity, it follows that the conjugate variable becomes cyclic. In this spirit, we will introduce the following pairs of action-angle variables: $(\Phi, N)$ measures the global phase and the total particle number $N = n_0^e + n_0^e + n_1^e + n_1^e$ of the system, $(\theta, M)$ measures the relative phase between left and right sites and the population imbalance $M = n_0^e + n_0^e - (n_1^e + n_1^e)$ in between, $(\phi_0, M_0 = n_0^e - n_0^e)$ and $(\phi_1, M_1 = n_1^e - n_1^e)$ measure the relative internal phase of the atoms on each site and the corresponding population difference. This coupling scheme for the phases and population imbalances has been illustrated in figure 5. By inverting the population relations, one finds the individual occupation number $n_i^e$ per site as

$$n_0^e = \frac{1}{4} (N + M + 2M_0), \quad n_0^g = \frac{1}{4} (N + M - 2M_0),$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$$n_1^e = \frac{1}{4} (N - M + 2M_1), \quad n_1^g = \frac{1}{4} (N - M - 2M_1).$$

Finally, we can use these physical coordinates in a canonical transformation from complex amplitudes to real action-angle variables

$$e_0 = e^{-i(\Phi + \theta + \phi_0)} \sqrt{n_0^e}, \quad g_0 = e^{-i(\Phi + \theta - \phi_0)} \sqrt{n_0^g}$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

$$e_1 = e^{-i(\Phi - \theta + \phi_1)} \sqrt{n_0^e}, \quad g_1 = e^{-i(\Phi - \theta - \phi_1)} \sqrt{n_1^g}.$$  

For later use it is also useful to introduce the auxiliary phases $\theta_i$, which are global phases of the subsystem on site $i$:

$$\theta_0 = \Phi + \theta, \quad \theta_1 = \Phi - \theta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

By substituting field amplitudes into the Lagrangian of equation (20), one can again identify the variables and corresponding canonical momenta as

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \Phi} = N, \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta} = M, \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi_0} = M_0, \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi_1} = M_1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)
With these new coordinates \((\Phi, \theta, \phi_0, \phi_1)\) and momenta \((N, M, M_0, M_1)\), we obtain a transformed Hamilton function

\[
\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}'(\theta, \phi_0, \phi_1, N, M, M_0, M_1)
\]

\[
= \Omega_0 \cos(2\phi_0) \sqrt{(N+M)^2/4 - M_0^2 + \delta_0 M_0 + \delta_1 M_1} - \Omega_0 \cos(2\phi_1) \sqrt{(N-M)^2/4 - M_1^2 + \frac{g}{4} (N^2 + M^2 + 2M_0^2 + 2M_1^2)} + \frac{\Lambda}{2} \cos(2\theta + \phi_0 - \phi_1) \sqrt{(N+M+2M_0)(N-M+2M_1)} + \frac{\Lambda}{2} \cos(2\theta - \phi_0 + \phi_1) \sqrt{(N+M-2M_0)(N-M-2M_1)}.
\]  

(30)

Obviously, the dynamics conserves the total energy \(\mathcal{H}'\) and the total particle number \(N'\), as neither time \(t\) nor the global phase \(\Phi\) appears explicitly. However, an interesting feature of this coupled JJ Hamilton function is the negative sign of the Josephson energy in the second line, which leads to a reversal of the current direction and is in direct analogy to equations (2) and (3). The Josephson current relations of the 0–\(\pi\) junction can be obtained from the Hamilton equations for the population change as

\[
\dot{M}_0 = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}'}{\partial \phi_0} = I_0 \sin(2\phi_0) + I_h,
\]

(31)

\[
\dot{M}_1 = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}'}{\partial \phi_1} = -I_1 \sin(2\phi_1) - I_h.
\]

(32)

Figure 5. Coupling pattern of two coupled JJs \(JJ_0\) and \(J J_1\) with local Rabi frequencies \(\Omega\) and intersite hopping rates \(\Lambda\). By definition, the sum of the phase differences vanishes, but one obtains the extra \(\pi\)-phase from the sign change of the Rabi coupling \(\Omega_1 = -\Omega_0 = e^{i\pi} \Omega_0\).

New Journal of Physics 10 (2008) 045020 (http://www.njp.org/)
Table 1. Two stationary solutions of the Hamilton equation, energies \( E_0 \) and \( E_1 \), field amplitudes \( \alpha = (e_0, g_0, e_1, g_1) \) and phases. The global phase of the left site, i.e. \( \theta_0 = 0 \), was chosen as the common ground.

| \( E \)  | \( e_0 \) | \( g_0 \) | \( e_1 \) | \( g_1 \) | \( \Theta \) | \( \phi_0 \) | \( \phi_1 \) | \( \theta_0 \) | \( \theta_1 \) |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| -129.84 | 2.82   | -6.48  | 2.82   | 6.48   | \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) | \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) | 0     | \( -\frac{\pi}{4} \) | 0     |
| -117.00 | 3.16   | -6.32  | -3.16  | -6.32  | \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) | \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) | 0     | \( -\frac{\pi}{4} \) | 0     |

Here, we have introduced critical currents \( I_i \), as well as a hopping current \( I_h \) by

\[
I_0 = 2\Omega_0 \sqrt{\left(N + M\right)^2/4 - M_0^2} \tag{33}
\]

\[
I_1 = 2\Omega_1 \sqrt{\left(N - M\right)^2/4 - M_1^2} \tag{34}
\]

\[
I_h = \frac{\Lambda}{2} \sin \left(2\theta + \phi_0 - \phi_1\right) \sqrt{\left(N + M + 2M_0\right)\left(N - M + 2M_1\right)}
- \frac{\Lambda}{2} \sin \left(2\theta - \phi_0 + \phi_1\right) \sqrt{\left(N + M - 2M_0\right)\left(N - M - 2M_1\right)}. \tag{35}
\]

For the parameters \( \delta = 1, \Omega_0 = 1, \Omega_1 = -1, \Lambda = 0.1, g = 0.005 \) and \( N = 100 \), we have numerically minimized the energy of equation (21), which is equivalent to the action-angle variable Hamilton function of equation (30) but is more easily accomplished by the method of steepest descent using equation (25). A nonvanishing detuning, \( \delta \), was chosen to avoid numerical problems with degeneracies. Consequently, we find two minima with energies \( E_0 < E_1 \). Please note that the amplitudes of the solutions \( \alpha \) are real valued. Due to the invariance of the solutions under global phase change, we can deliberately modify them and choose the global phase of the left site as the common ground \( \theta_0 = 0 \). In table 1, we have listed the closely spaced energies, the real valued amplitudes and the phases calculated according to equations (27) and (28).

In figure 6, we present the phases for the two states listed in table 1 graphically and compare them with the solution of the sine-Gordon equation [63] already presented in figure 1(b). The gray level represents the value of the Josephson (potential) energy, which is obtained from equations (2) and (3) or equation (30) by keeping the momenta constant and varying the phases \( \theta_i \) around their equilibrium values. While the solution of the discrete model clearly lacks the smoothness of the continuum model at the 0–\( \pi \) boundary, it represents the asymptotics well. On one hand, this can be rectified by discussing the extended two-component Gross–Pitaevskii equation (13). On the other hand, a few mode quantum model can be very useful for studying the effects of macroscopic tunneling.

4. Conclusion and perspectives

In the present paper, we have briefly summarized the status of fluxon and semifluxon physics in superconductivity. In particular, we have focused on an effect that exists in a long 0–\( \pi \) geometry where two JJs were in the ground state and one obtains a Josephson vortex of fractional magnetic flux, pinned at the 0–\( \pi \) boundary. Depending on the preparation procedure, this ‘classical’ state
Figure 6. Comparison of a spatially extended 0–π junction in a superconductor (left panel) calculated according to the sine-Gordon equation [63] to an analog, two-site junction in an atomic BEC (right panel). We have plotted the scaled global phase $\theta_i$ versus the site index $i = 0, 1$. The gray level represents the value of the Josephson (potential) energy, where dark means low values and light means high values.

of the superconducting device can occur in two different configurations: with the magnetic flux equal to $+\Phi_0/2$ or $-\Phi_0/2$.

This arrangement of superconducting junctions has been analyzed and transferred to the context of an atomic bosonic quantum gas, where two-state atoms in a double well trap are coupled in a similar fashion. There, the optical 0–π junction is represented by the left/right localized internal atomic JJJs and a jumping phase of the complex-valued Rabi frequency. We have derived a simple four-mode model for this case and showed that in the ‘classical’ approximation it qualitatively resembles the semifluxons seen in superconductivity.

In the superconducting case, one observes a smooth spatial behavior of the phase across the 0–π boundary. In the atomic case, this will emerge also by a more realistic modeling for the Rabi-frequency and spatial motion. This is currently under investigation. Eventually, the four-mode, 0–π Josephson model will also be instrumental in examining the quantum properties of these macroscopic semifluxon states and we will explore the macroscopic tunneling between them [63]. This is also a work in progress and will be reported in a forthcoming publication.
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