

**Soliton “molecules”: Robust clusters of spatiotemporal optical solitons**

Lucian-Cornel Crasovan,<sup>\*</sup> Yaroslav V. Kartashov,<sup>†</sup> Dumitru Mihalache,<sup>\*</sup> and Lluís Torner  
*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fotoniques, and Department of Signal Theory and Communications, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya,  
 ES 08034 Barcelona, Spain*

Yuri S. Kivshar  
*Nonlinear Physics Group, Research School of Physical Sciences and Engineering, The Australian National University,  
 Canberra, Australia*

Víctor M. Pérez-García  
*Departamento de Matemáticas, E.T.S.I. Industriales, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain*  
 (Received 12 November 2002; published 21 April 2003)

We show how to generate robust self-sustained clusters of soliton bullets—spatiotemporal (optical or matter-wave) solitons. The clusters carry an orbital angular momentum being supported by competing nonlinearities. The “atoms” forming the “molecule” are fully three-dimensional solitons linked via a staircaselike macroscopic phase. Recent progress in generating atomic-molecular coherent mixing in the Bose-Einstein condensates might open potential scenarios for the experimental generation of these soliton molecules with matter waves.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.67.046610

PACS number(s): 42.65.Tg, 42.65.Ky

Solitons—nonspreading, self-sustained wave packets—are at the core of nonlinear science, thus they have been investigated and observed in a variety of settings during the last two decades [1]. Today, one of the most challenging open frontiers of the field is the elucidation of complex soliton structures or “soliton molecules” to be constructed from a number of “atoms,” each being a fundamental soliton. However, multisoliton structures found so far [2–10] tend to self-destroy through expansion or collapse, or at best exist as metastable states which break apart by small perturbations. Here we reveal a physical mechanism for generating clusters which are made of stable fully three-dimensional light bullets that propagate stably over huge distances even in the presence of random perturbations in the initial conditions. The core of our approach is the use of two-color parametric solitons supported by competing nonlinearities [11,12], which allow both, to generate stable fully three-dimensional solitons and to reduce the soliton-soliton interactions and enhancing the clusters robustness. The clusters are thus multicolored, carry orbital angular momentum, and are linked via a staircaselike macroscopic phase distribution. We present the analysis for optical spatiotemporal solitons, but our findings are intended to stimulate further theoretical and experimental research in the case of matter waves in the Bose-Einstein condensates [13–16].

Spatiotemporal optical solitons, the so-called “light bullets” (LBs), are self-sustained objects localized in all spatial dimensions and in time [17–24] (for a recent overview see Ref. [25]). They result from the simultaneous balance of diffraction and dispersion by the medium nonlinearity, and a

two-dimensional version has recently been generated in quadratic nonlinear media [26]. On one hand, spatiotemporal solitons are challenging objects for fundamental research, as examples of stable localized objects in three-dimensional nonlinear fields are rare in physics. On the other hand, spatiotemporal solitons hold promise for potential applications in future ultrafast all-optical processing devices [27–29], where each soliton represents a bit of information and should be employed for digital operations. Multichannel all-optical soliton networks have been proposed based on the concept of soliton clusters [30], the structures carrying many interacting individual solitons, recently introduced for two-dimensional solitons in saturable nonlinear media [6].

Soliton clusters can be viewed as a nontrivial generalization of “spinning” solitons (or doughnutlike vortices) [31–37] and necklace-ring beams [2–5], and they also appear in the study of active nonlinear systems such as externally driven optical cavities [38,39]. But the soliton clusters investigated so far tend to be unstable or metastable under the action of small perturbations. We have recently shown in the case of two-dimensional spatial solitons, that the competition between quadratic and cubic nonlinearities reduces the strength of the soliton-soliton interactions, thus making spatial soliton clusters more robust under propagation [40]. Here, we consider for the first time the case of clusters made of fully three-dimensional light bullets, and show that they propagate stably over huge distances even in the presence of random perturbations.

We consider the propagation of two-color (fundamental wave and second harmonic) LB molecules (see the sketch in Fig. 1) in a bulk dispersive medium with competing quadratic and cubic (Kerr) self-defocusing nonlinearities. Under suitable conditions, the interaction between a fundamental frequency (FF) signal and its second harmonic (SH), in the presence of the self-defocusing cubic nonlinearity, dispersion and diffraction in the (3 + 1)-dimensional geometry, can be described by the reduced model [41–43]

<sup>\*</sup>Also at Department of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Atomic Physics, P.O. Box MG-6, Bucharest, Romania.

<sup>†</sup>Permanent address: Physics Department, M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Vorobiovy gory, 119899 Moscow, Russia.




FIG. 1. (Color online) Cluster composed of six spatiotemporal two-color solitons. The topological charge  $M$  of the soliton cluster is equal to one. (a) The fundamental frequency field and (b) the second harmonic field. (c) The phase distribution at fundamental frequency and (d) the phase distribution at the second harmonic.

$$i \frac{\partial u}{\partial Z} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial X^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial Y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial T^2} \right) + u^* v - \alpha (|u|^2 + 2|v|^2) u = 0,$$

$$i \frac{\partial v}{\partial Z} + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial X^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial Y^2} + \sigma \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial T^2} \right) - \beta v + u^2 - 2\alpha (2|u|^2 + |v|^2) v = 0. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $T$ ,  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $Z$  are the normalized reduced time, transverse spatial coordinates, and propagation distance,  $u$  and  $v$  are envelopes of the FF and SH fields,  $\alpha$  measures the strength of the defocusing cubic nonlinearity, and  $\beta$  is a phase mismatch between the FF and SH waves. Here  $*$  stands for the complex conjugate of a complex field. Equations (1) assume different group-velocity dispersion coefficients at the two frequencies,  $\sigma$  being their ratio, and assumes that the temporal group-velocity mismatch between them has been compensated. Notice that Eqs. (1) correspond to the simplest model of light propagation in media with competing nonlinearities (e.g., it assumes a noncritical, type I, oo, or ee wave interaction). In practice, the strength of each of the possible cross-phase modulations depends critically on the crystalline symmetry of the particular material employed through the polarizations of the fields involved, hence the actual value of the relevant elements of the nonlinear susceptibility tensor. However, Eq. (1) are expected to capture the essential physics behind the soliton cluster evolution.

The interaction Hamiltonian of the system

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int \int \int \{ [ (|u_x|^2 + |u_y|^2 + |u_T|^2) + \frac{1}{4} (|v_x|^2 + |v_y|^2 + \sigma |v_T|^2) ] + [\beta |v|^2 - (u^* v + u^2 v^*) + \alpha (|u|^4 + 4|u|^2 |v|^2 + |v|^4)] \} dX dY dT \quad (2)$$




FIG. 2. Effective interaction potential versus initial cluster radius for (a)  $N=4$ , (b)  $N=5$ , and (c)  $N=6$  soliton clusters for different net topological charges. Typical oscillations of the mean cluster radius of solitons clusters with spin  $M=1$  for (d)  $N=4$ ,  $R_0=12$ ,  $E_{LB}=2824$ , (e)  $N=5$ ,  $R_0=16$ ,  $E_{LB}=2100$ , and (f)  $N=6$ ,  $R_0=12$  and  $E_{LB}=2100$ .

is a conserved quantity during evolution. Its absolute and local minima correspond to stable and metastable configurations, respectively.

Circular light-bullet necklaces were constructed as superposition of  $N$  fundamental spatiotemporal solitons with different phases such that the overall phase jump around the core is a multiple of  $2\pi$  (see Fig. 1). We thus have

$$u(Z=0) = \sum_{n=1}^N u_0(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_n) e^{i\phi_n},$$

$$v(Z=0) = \sum_{n=1}^N v_0(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_n) e^{2i\phi_n},$$

where  $u_0$ ,  $v_0$  are the fundamental solitons at both frequencies,  $\vec{r}_n$  are the soliton locations, whereas the soliton phases at those points are  $\phi_n = 2n\pi M/N$  and  $2\phi_n$ , respectively. Here  $M$  determines the full phase twist around the cluster and plays the role of a topological charge (“spin”). We have considered circular soliton arrays, i.e., equally spaced atoms displaced on a circle of radius  $R_0$ . First, by appropriate numerical techniques (a standard band-matrix algorithm to deal with the resulting two-point boundary-value problem) we have found the families of stationary solutions to Eq. (1)—i.e., the fundamental (nonspinning) three-dimensional spatiotemporal solitons ( $u_0$ ,  $v_0$ ). In fact, the stationary three-dimensional parametric soliton can be well approximated by a super-Gaussian “ansatz” with suitable chosen amplitudes and widths for both the FF and SH fields.

The parameters that play an important role in the dynamics of the LB molecules are the necklace topological charge  $M$ , the number of “pearls”  $N$  forming the cluster, the initial radius of the necklace  $R_0$ , the energy  $E_{LB}$  of each constituent soliton, the wave-vector mismatch  $\beta$  and the strength of the defocusing cubic nonlinearity  $\alpha$ . In almost all of our calculations we have considered the phase matching of the interacting waves, taking thus  $\beta=0$ . We have also set  $\sigma=1$ ,




FIG. 3. Stable evolution of soliton clusters with  $M=1$  under superimposed input random noise. Shown are the contour plots for the  $N=4$  cluster: (a),  $Z=0$ ; (b),  $Z=25$ ; (c),  $Z=50$  and the contour plots for the  $N=5$  cluster: (d),  $Z=0$ ; (e),  $Z=25$ ; (f),  $Z=50$ . Only the  $(X, Y)$  slices at  $T=0$  of the fundamental frequency component are shown; the second harmonic field exhibits a similar behavior. The other parameters are the same as in Fig. 2(d) for the  $N=4$  cluster and as in Fig. 2(e) for the  $N=5$  one.

assuming equal dispersions at both frequencies, and  $\alpha=0.2$  as the dynamical equations possess scaling properties with respect to  $\alpha$ . By increasing the strength of the defocusing cubic nonlinearity one will slow down the interaction between the constituent atoms. Taking into account that the medium with competing nonlinearities supports stable spatiotemporal vortices (vortex tori) with unit topological charge when their energy exceeds a threshold [44], we have studied in detail the dynamics of soliton molecules which have the total energy exceeding the corresponding stability threshold energy of the vortex soliton. Because the energy threshold for the existence of a stable vortex torus at  $\alpha=0.2$  is  $E_{th} \approx 9120$ , we have considered here clusters with  $N=5$  and  $N=6$  solitons, each constituent having the energy  $E_{LB}=2100$ , whereas for the cluster with  $N=4$  atoms, the individual energy  $E_{LB}=2824$  was correspondingly higher.

Firstly, we have studied the dependence of the cluster interaction Hamiltonian [or equivalently, the effective potential, defined as  $H(R_0)/|H(\infty)|$ ] on the initial radius  $R_0$  and on the necklace charge  $M$ . This quantity gives important hints when looking for soliton bound states (see, e.g., Refs. [6,45] for a detailed analysis). While the interaction Hamiltonian for the  $N=4$  clusters does not possess any minima whatever the topological charge is [see Fig. 2(a)], for  $N=5$  and  $N=6$ , local minima of the Hamiltonian are present for charge  $M=1$ . For  $N=5$  the minimum is at  $R_0=13.5$ ,

whereas for  $N=6$  the minimum is at  $R_0=12$ . In our simulations we have added normally distributed noise with zero mean and variance  $\sigma_{noise}=0.1$  to the input molecules. Keeping  $M=1$ , we have varied the initial cluster radius  $R_0$  around the minimum value given by the effective potential approach and have found a range of optimal values of the input radii that minimize the mean radius oscillations of the soliton cluster. For  $N=6$  the value  $R_0=12$  lies in the optimal radius interval, whereas for  $N=5$ , the value  $R_0=16$  assures small oscillations of the mean radius.

In order to check the predictions given by the study of the effective potential, we have numerically solved Eq. (1) by using a finite-difference scheme based on a Crank-Nicholson time discretization followed by a Newton-Picard iterative technique and the Gauss-Seidel method for solving the obtained system of equations. Transparent boundary conditions allowing the radiation to escape from the computation window have been implemented. We have monitored the evolution of the mean radius of the cluster defined as

$$R(Z) = \frac{1}{E} \int \int \int (X^2 + Y^2 + T^2)^{1/2} (|u|^2 + |v|^2) dXdYdT, \tag{3}$$

where  $E = \int \int \int (|u|^2 + |v|^2) dXdYdT$  is the total energy. If the initial radius  $R_0$  of the cluster is large, then the mean radius  $R(0)$  at the entrance of the nonlinear medium amounts to  $R(0) \approx R_0$ .

The evolution of clusters with  $N=4$  ( $R_0=12$ ) and  $N=5$  ( $R_0=16$ ) constituents is quite robust as shown in Fig. 3. The molecules undergo rotation and clean up the initial noise in the first stages of propagation. Our estimations for the angular velocity  $\omega$  of the soliton clusters end up with  $\omega=0.0027$  (radians/propagation units) for the  $N=4$  cluster shown in Fig. 3 and  $\omega=0.0014$  for the  $N=5$  one. Thus, cluster rotations are observable after large propagation distances. Only after thousands of diffraction lengths a quasiperiodic shrinking and expansion followed by a decay into several unequal fragments is observed as seen in Fig. 4. Our soliton clusters are much more robust than the LB clusters in quadratic and cubic saturable materials that survive only a few diffraction lengths in the presence of initial random noise.

The simulations with other necklace charges ( $M=0$ ,  $M=2$ , and  $M=3$ ) for clusters composed of  $N=5$  ( $R_0=16$ ) and  $N=6$  ( $R_0=12$ ), show that the LBs forming the  $M=0$  molecule fuse in 100–150 propagation units, whereas the soliton clusters with net charges  $M=2$  or  $M=3$  expand in-




FIG. 4. (Color online) Cluster evolution over long distances and the onset of symmetry breaking instability. Shown are the isosurfaces  $|u|=1.1$  for the  $N=4$  (a)–(d) and the  $N=5$  cluster (e)–(h). The parameters are the same as in Figs. 2(d) and 2(e).




FIG. 5. (Color online) Comparative evolution of two clusters with identical intensity distributions but different phase masks. The net topological charge is the same ( $M=1$ ) in both situations. Top panels, evolution of a six-soliton molecule with a steplike phase distribution; bottom panels, evolution of a six-soliton molecule with a ramplike phase distribution. Shown are the isosurfaces  $|u|=1.1$ . The insets in panels (a) and (e) show the initial phase mask.

definitely. Detailed simulations performed for the  $N=6$ -light bullet clusters with  $M=2$  show that, by varying the initial cluster radius, the clusters formed with overlapping solitons ( $10 < R_0 < 20$ ) expand rapidly, whereas the clusters built with well separated LBs ( $R_0 > 22$ ) have a moderate mean radius variation for a propagation distance over 600 diffraction lengths. Notice that for a typical diffraction length of a few millimeters, this corresponds to several meters, orders of magnitude larger than the feasible crystal lengths. Similar results were obtained for the non phase-matching case ( $\beta \neq 0$ ).

We have also studied the influence of the initial phase distribution on the cluster dynamics by simulating the evolution of two configurations with identical intensity distributions but different phases.

The first one, build as per Eq. (3), having a staircaselike phase, destroys finally, after thousands of diffraction lengths, by splitting into two spatiotemporal solitons [Figs. 5(a)–5(d)], while the second one, having a ramplike phase mask [see the inset of Fig. 5(e)], develops into a vortex torus [Figs. 5(e)–5(h)]. Thus, we arrive at the conclusion that the key factor that impede the LB molecule with a staircaselike macroscopic phase to excite a vortex soliton is the sequence of the phase edge dislocations [see the inset in Fig. 5(a)] existing between the neighboring solitons which form the cluster.

In summary, we have revealed a key physical mechanism for creating truly three-dimensional light bullet clusters which survive under random perturbations of the initial conditions. We have generated such structures numerically for a nonlinear optical medium with competing quadratic and cu-

bic nonlinearities. The experimental demonstration of the concept with light waves faces many important challenges, including the generation of single light bullet. This goal requires the elucidation of a material setting with high quadratic nonlinearity, suitable group-velocity dispersions and low one-photon and two-photon absorption at both FF and SH wavelengths, as well as small group-velocity dispersion, together with adequate cubic nonlinearities. This is a formidable task, thus progress is being made slowly. In this context we would like to mention that it was shown recently that the strength of the cubic nonlinearity can be tuned by means of optical rectification [46] even though at present the technique has been developed only for one-dimensional beams.

However, although we showed the concept in the case of light waves, our study is important to other fields such as the physics of hybrid atomic-molecular Bose-Einstein condensates [47–54]. Indeed, recent experiments demonstrated coherent mixing of atomic-molecular condensates [54] which under suitable conditions should be approximately described by coupled equations for the macroscopic wave functions similar to Eq. (1) [47–52]. Taking into account that to date the experimental observations of bright solitons in condensates are restricted to quasi-one-dimensional geometries [13,14], the matter-wave analog of our light bullet clusters would correspond to clusters of condensate drops existing without a trap.

This work has been supported by the Generalitat de Catalunya and by the Spanish Government under Contract Nos. TIC2000-1010 and BFM2002-2861. Support from NATO (L.-C.C.) and IBERDROLA S. A., Spain (D.M.) is acknowledged.

[1] See N.N. Akhmediev and A. Ankiewicz, *Solitons: Nonlinear Pulses and Beams* (Chapman and Hall, London, 1997); Yu. S. Kivshar and G. P. Agrawal, *Optical Solitons: From Fibers to Photonic Crystals* (Academic Press, San Diego, 2003), and references therein.  
 [2] M. Soljagic, S. Sears, and M. Segev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4851 (1998).  
 [3] M. Soljagic and M. Segev, Phys. Rev. E **62**, 2810 (2000).  
 [4] M. Soljagic and M. Segev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 420 (2001).  
 [5] A.S. Desyatnikov and Yu.S. Kivshar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**,

033901 (2001).  
 [6] A.S. Desyatnikov and Yu.S. Kivshar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 053901 (2002).  
 [7] L. Torner, J.P. Torres, D.V. Petrov, and J.M. Soto-Crespo, Opt. Quantum Electron. **30**, 89 (1998).  
 [8] D.V. Petrov, L. Torner, J. Martorell, R. Vilaseca, J.P. Torres, and C. Cojocaru, Opt. Lett. **23**, 1444 (1998).  
 [9] S. Minardi, G. Molina-Terriza, P. Di Trapani, J.P. Torres, and L. Torner, Opt. Lett. **26**, 1004 (2001).  
 [10] Y.V. Kartashov, G. Molina-Terriza, and L. Torner, J. Opt. Soc.

- Am. B **19**, 2682 (2002).
- [11] W.E. Torruellas, Z. Wang, D.J. Hagan, E.W. VanStryland, G.I. Stegeman, L. Torner, and C.R. Menyuk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 5036 (1995).
- [12] A.V. Buryak, P. Di Trapani, D. Skryabin, and S. Trillo, Phys. Rep. **370**, 63 (2002).
- [13] K.E. Strecker, G.B. Partridge, A.G. Truscott, and R.G. Hulet, Nature (London) **417**, 150 (2002).
- [14] L. Khaykovich, F. Schreck, G. Ferrari, T. Bourdel, J. Cubizolles, L.D. Carr, Y. Castin, and C. Salomon, Science **296**, 1290 (2002).
- [15] J.R. Anglin and W. Ketterle, Nature (London) **416**, 211 (2002).
- [16] B.P. Anderson and P. Meystre, Opt. Photonics News **13**, 20 (2002).
- [17] Y. Silberberg, Opt. Lett. **15**, 1282 (1990); B.A. Malomed, P. Drummond, H. He, A. Berntson, D. Anderson, and M. Lisak, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 4725 (1997); D.V. Skryabin and W.J. Firth, Opt. Commun. **148**, 79 (1998); D. Mihalache, D. Mazilu, B.A. Malomed, and L. Torner, *ibid.* **152**, 365 (1998).
- [18] N. Akhmediev and J.M. Soto-Crespo, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 1358 (1993); R. McLeod, K. Wagner, and S. Blair, *ibid.* **52**, 3254 (1995); D.E. Edmundson, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 7636 (1997); B. Gross and J.T. Manassah, Opt. Commun. **129**, 143 (1996); L. Bergé, Phys. Rep. **303**, 260 (1998); H. He and P.D. Drummond, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 5025 (1998).
- [19] D. Mihalache, D. Mazilu, J. Dörring, and L. Torner, Opt. Commun. **159**, 129 (1999).
- [20] D. Mihalache, D. Mazilu, B.A. Malomed, and L. Torner, Opt. Commun. **169**, 341 (1999); D. Mihalache, D. Mazilu, L.-C. Crasovan, L. Torner, B.A. Malomed, and F. Lederer, Phys. Rev. E **62**, 7340 (2000).
- [21] S. Raghavan and G.P. Agrawal, Opt. Commun. **180**, 377 (2000).
- [22] I.V. Mel’nikov, D. Mihalache, and N.-C. Panouiu, Opt. Commun. **181**, 345 (2000).
- [23] M. Blaauboer, B.A. Malomed, and G. Kurizki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1906 (2000).
- [24] L. Torner, S. Carrasco, J.P. Torres, L.-C. Crasovan, and D. Mihalache, Opt. Commun. **199**, 277 (2001).
- [25] F. Wise and P. Di Trapani, Opt. Photonics News **13**(2), 28 (2002).
- [26] X. Liu, L.J. Qian, and F.W. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4631 (1999).
- [27] A.W. Snyder and F. Ladouceur, Opt. Photonics News **10**(2), 35 (1999).
- [28] G.I. Stegeman and M. Segev, Science **286**, 1518 (1999).
- [29] X. Liu, K. Beckwitt, and F.W. Wise, Phys. Rev. E **61**, R4722 (2000).
- [30] Yu.S. Kivshar and G.I. Stegeman, Opt. Photonics News **13**(2), 59 (2002).
- [31] V.I. Kruglov and R.A. Vlasov, Phys. Lett. A **111**, 401 (1985).
- [32] V. Tikhonenko, J. Christou, and B. Luther-Davies, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **12**, 2046 (1995).
- [33] L. Torner and D.V. Petrov, Electron. Lett. **33**, 608 (1997).
- [34] W.J. Firth and D.V. Skryabin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2450 (1997).
- [35] J.P. Torres, J.M. Soto-Crespo, L. Torner, and D.V. Petrov, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **15**, 625 (1998).
- [36] I. Towers, A.V. Buryak, R.A. Sammut, and B.A. Malomed, Phys. Rev. E **63**, 055601(R) (2001).
- [37] D. Mihalache, D. Mazilu, L.-C. Crasovan, I. Towers, A.V. Buryak, B.A. Malomed, L. Torner, J.P. Torres, and F. Lederer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 073902 (2002).
- [38] A.G. Vladimirov, J.M. McSloy, Dmitry V. Skryabin, and W.J. Firth, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 046606 (2002).
- [39] D.V. Skryabin and A.G. Vladimirov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 044101 (2002).
- [40] Y.V. Kartashov, L.-C. Crasovan, D. Mihalache, and L. Torner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 273902 (2002).
- [41] C.R. Menyuk, R. Schiek, and L. Torner, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **11**, 2434 (1994).
- [42] A.V. Buryak, Yu.S. Kivshar, and S. Trillo, Opt. Lett. **20**, 1961 (1995).
- [43] O. Bang, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **14**, 51 (1997); O. Bang, Yu.S. Kivshar, A.V. Buryak, A. De Rossi, and S. Trillo, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 5057 (1998).
- [44] D. Mihalache, D. Mazilu, L.-C. Crasovan, I. Towers, B.A. Malomed, A.V. Buryak, L. Torner, and F. Lederer, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 016613 (2002).
- [45] B.A. Malomed, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 7928 (1998).
- [46] J.P. Torres, S.L. Palacios, L. Torner, L.-C. Crasovan, D. Mihalache, and I. Biaggio, Opt. Lett. **27**, 1631 (2002); J.P. Torres, L. Torner, I. Biaggio, and M. Segev, Opt. Commun. **213**, 351 (2002).
- [47] P.S. Julienne, K. Burnett, Y.B. Band, and W.C. Stwalley, Phys. Rev. A **58**, R797 (1998).
- [48] D.J. Heinzen, R. Wynar, P.D. Drummond, and K.V. Kheruntsyan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5029 (2000).
- [49] J. Javanainen and M. Mackie, Phys. Rev. A **59**, R3186 (1998).
- [50] L.-M. Duan, A. Sorensen, J.I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3991 (2000).
- [51] B.J. Cusack, T.J. Alexander, E.A. Ostrovskaya, and Yu.S. Kivshar, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 013609 (2001).
- [52] S.J.J.M.F. Kokkelmans and M.J. Holland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180401 (2002).
- [53] R. Wynar, R.S. Freeland, D.J. Han, C. Ryu, and D.J. Heinzen, Science **287**, 1016 (2000).
- [54] E.A. Donley, N.R. Claussen, S.T. Thompson, and C.E. Wieman, Nature (London) **417**, 529 (2002).