

Comment on “Large Fluctuations for Spatial Diffusion of Cold Atoms”

Igor Goychuk

*Institute of Physics and Astronomy, University of Potsdam,
Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24/25, 14476 Potsdam-Golm, Germany*

A comment on the Letter by E. Aghion, D. Kessler, and E. Barkai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 260601 (2017). An important criterion on finite kinetic temperature of the system of cold atoms is established. It is shown that the kinetic temperature becomes infinite in Fig. 1 of the commented paper in the course of time, i.e. the considered model system becomes asymptotically infinitely hot. Moreover, within this model the behavior of the squared width of the spatial distribution of atoms at the half of its maximum is very different from the variance of the particle positions. In particular, in the discussed Fig. 1 the former one increases sub-ballistically in time, while the variance grows super-ballistically, which corresponds to a heating phase. This leads to a profound ambiguity in definition and classification of anomalous diffusion. All in all, the model in the commented paper simply does not fit to experiments with cold atoms.

In a recent Letter [1], the authors claim to study a system of cold atoms in a non-heating phase. Below, I show that kinetic temperature of these “cold” atoms becomes infinite in Fig. 1 of [1] in the course of time.

Indeed, the stochastic dynamics in their Eq. (1) is always far away from thermal equilibrium. This is so because the noise and frictional terms in their Eq. (1) are not related by the fluctuation-dissipation theorem [2]. Hence, the equilibrium velocity distribution *never* exists in such a system. What they incorrectly name equilibrium distribution is the steady state solution of the Fokker-Planck equation [2, 3]

$$\frac{\partial P(v, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left[D e^{-U(v)/D} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} e^{U(v)/D} P(v, t) \right], \quad (1)$$

which in [1, 4] corresponds to a fictitious “velocity potential” $U(v) = (1/2) \ln(1 + v^2)$. This steady state solution reads obviously [4],

$$P_{\text{st}}(v) = C e^{-U(v)/D} = \frac{C}{(1 + v^2)^{1/(2D)}}, \quad (2)$$

where $C = \Gamma(1/(2D))/[\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(1/(2D) - 1/2)]$ is the normalization constant for $D < 1$, and for $D \geq 1$ the steady-state density is not normalizable. The authors name the parameter regime $D > 1$ the heating phase and do not consider it further. However, what is the steady-state kinetic temperature T_{kin} of the particles described by their equation (1)? In accordance with the basic principles of statistical physics it can be defined by the mean kinetic energy of the particles provided that $\langle v(t) \rangle = 0$ (the case) as $k_B T_{\text{kin}}(t) = M \langle v^2(t) \rangle$ ($M = 1$, $k_B = 1$ in their paper), where $\langle v^n(t) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v^n P(v, t) dv$, in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$. This is a standard definition of the kinetic temperature extended beyond equilibrium [2, 3, 7]. From this and Eq. (2) it immediately follows that both the *steady-state* mean kinetic energy and the corresponding kinetic temperature are **infinite** for $D \geq 1/3$. Indeed,

$$T_{\text{kin}}(\infty) = \langle v^2(\infty) \rangle = \frac{D}{1 - 3D} \quad (3)$$

for $D < 1/3$, and $T_{\text{kin}}(\infty) = \langle v^2(\infty) \rangle = \infty$ otherwise. Apart from the temperature interpretation, this is the same expression as Eq. (4) in [4]. Unfortunately, anything is stated in [1] on that for any asymptotically

finite kinetic temperature one must fulfill this very important, crucial condition $D < 1/3$. For example, in the experimental work [5] and in Fig. 2 of the minireview [6], $D = (q - 1)/2 \approx 0.19 \div 0.198$, with $q \approx 1.38 \div 1.396$ therein, i.e. it obeys this condition. In fact, in Ref. [4] the authors show in Eq. (15) that $\langle v^2(t) \rangle$, and hence also kinetic temperature, grows algebraically in time for $1/3 < D < 1$,

$$T_{\text{kin}}(t) = \langle v^2(t) \rangle \propto t^{3/2-1/(2D)}. \quad (4)$$

Hence, in Fig. 1 of [1] for $D = 0.4 > 1/3$, the particles heat up to the infinity. Therefore, they cannot be considered cold, contrary to what is stated in [1], even in its title. As a matter of fact, the parameter regime of continuous heating starts from $D \geq 1/3$, and not from $D > 1$, as misleadingly stated in [1]. Important to note that for $D \geq 1/3$ a popular operational definition of the effective temperature T_{eff} by relating it to the width of $P(v)$ at its half-maximum loses any sense within the model of Refs. [1, 4] and Eq. (2) because in this parameter regime it spectacularly contradicts to a commonly accepted, textbook meaning of the kinetic temperature. The validity of this comment can be easily seen from the result on the spatial variance growth in Eqs. (6), (7) of [1] yielding

$$\langle \delta x^2(t) \rangle \propto t^{\alpha(D)} \quad (5)$$

with $\alpha(D) = 7/2 - 1/(2D)$ for $1/5 < D < 1$. Hence, super-diffusion is sub-ballistic for $1/5 < D < 1/3$ with $\alpha(D)$ gradually growing from $\alpha = 1$ at $D \leq 1/5$ to $\alpha = 2$ at $D = 1/3$. For $D > 1/3$, when the particles are heated up continuously, it becomes super-ballistic. Obviously, in this heating regime

$$\langle \delta x^2(t) \rangle \propto T_{\text{kin}}(t) t^2, \quad (6)$$

which corresponds to ballistic diffusion with algebraically growing temperature. Earlier, similar hyperdiffusive result was found in Ref. [7] within a very different model, where the kinetic temperature increases only transiently. Furthermore, even if the regime $D > 1$ was not studied in Ref. [1], Eq. (15) of [4] implies that in this case one obtains the Richardson type diffusion

$$\langle \delta x^2(t) \rangle \propto t^3. \quad (7)$$




FIG. 1. Dependence of the scaling exponent δ on the optical lattice depth U_0/E_R in units of recoil energy. Blue squares and red circles are the data extracted from Fig. 3 of Ref. [8] using Engauge Digitizer 10.1. Blue squares correspond to the scaling exponent δ (which is denoted α in [8]) extracted from the width of the probability distribution, while the red circles correspond to the data fit from a measure for self-similarity used in [8]). An excellent agreement between these two experimental measures in [8], except for two outliers for small U_0 , confirms that the probability density is self-similar. The fit with the model in [1] yields the best fit value $c \approx 3.74$ in $D = cE_R/U_0$ (full blue line using $\delta(D)$), or $c \approx 3.48$ (broken blue line using $\nu(D)$). Even the best fit is clearly unacceptable. Notice that below the line $\delta = 2/3$ of Richardson diffusion this fit actually does not make much sense. It must be bounded by $2/3 \leq \delta \leq 2$. The full red line would correspond to $c = 20$ in [1] and $\delta(D)$. It is completely at odds with experiment. For this value of the parameter c and experimental values of E_R/U_0 , the model of [1] yields only super-ballistic Richardson diffusion.

Let us now clarify if the model in Refs. [1, 4] can be supported by experiments with cold atoms. One of such recent experiments [8] reveals sub-ballistic superdiffusion which is characterized by a Lévy distribution of the particles positions $W_{\text{central}}(x, t)$ obeying the scaling $W_{\text{central}}(x, t) = t^{-1/\delta} \mathcal{L}_\delta(z = x/t^{1/\delta})$, where $\mathcal{L}_\delta(z)$ is a Lévy distribution with index $0 < \delta < 2$. In [8], diffusion is characterized by the square of the width of $W(x, t)$ at its half-maximum. It must be emphasized that such a Lévy distribution in any experiment has necessarily cutoffs, i.e. it is tempered or truncated. This can be clearly seen e.g. in Figs. 1 and 5 of [8], where experimental distributions do not extend beyond several millimeters from their center. Also the model in [1] clearly supports such cutoffs. For any properly tempered Lévy distribution, and even for any other distribution $\mathcal{L}_\delta(z)$ with finite second moment, $\langle \delta x^2(t) \rangle$ is finite and proportional to its squared width, at any time. This is just due to the experimentally observed scaling. Therefore, it would be reasonable to conclude that also experimentally $\langle \delta x^2(t) \rangle \propto t^{2/\delta}$ and we can identify $\delta = 2/\alpha(D)$ to compare the theory in [1] and the experiment in [8]. This comparison is shown in Fig. 1, with $\delta(D) = 4D/(7D - 1)$, where $D = cE_R/U_0$, U_0 is the optical lattice depth and E_R is the recoil energy, with c being a single fitting parameter. Even the best

fit with $c \approx 3.74$ is not acceptable, not saying already about $c \approx 20$ suggested in [1]. However, in [1] the central part of $W(x, t)$ is given by the Lévy distribution with another index

$$\nu(D) = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3D} \quad (8)$$

instead of our $\delta(D)$. Notice that only for two values of D , $D = 1/5$ (normal diffusion) and $D = 1$ (Richardson diffusion), $\nu = \delta$, which has dramatic consequences, see below. Also fitting the experimental data with $\nu(D)$ instead of $\delta(D)$ does not help, see in Fig. 1. Even for the optimal value $c \approx 3.48$ in the corresponding fit, the theory does not match experiment.

Furthermore, an interesting aspect of the theory in [1] is that the tail of $W(x, t)$, which is named infinite density therein, has a very different scaling from the central part of $W(x, t)$. This tail is scaled as $W_{\text{tail}}(x, t) = t^{-1-1/(2D)} \mathcal{I}(z = x/t^{3/2})$, where $\mathcal{I}(z)$ is a scaling function obtained in Ref. [1]. Namely this scaling yields Eq. (5). However, the experimental data in [8] do not seem to support such a tail. The found in experiment scaling is very different. Most strikingly, the theory in [1] implies that the diffusional spread of $W(x, t)$ defined by its squared width at the half-maximum should be very different from the diffusional spread of the variance of the particles position. If found experimentally, this very unusual behavior would mean that the very definition of anomalous diffusion would heavily depend on how to define the width of $W(x, t)$. For example, for $D = 1/3$, which corresponds to the ballistic diffusion in a standard definition with spatial variance, $\nu = 4/3$, and $2/\nu = 3/2$, which would correspond to sub-ballistic diffusion from another point of view. For $D = 0.4$ in Fig. 1 of [1], $\nu = 7/6$, which still corresponds to sub-ballistic diffusion from the alternative point of view. However, in this case particles heat up to infinity and diffusion is clearly superballistic from the standard point of view of the spreading spatial variance. I do not think, however, that such a strikingly unusual ambiguity of interpretation has ever been found experimentally.

To conclude, the applicability of the model in [1, 4] to the systems of cold atoms is questionable not only in the heating superballistic phase $D \geq 1/3$, but also overall.

Funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Grant GO 2052/3-1 is gratefully acknowledged.

-
- [1] E. Aghion, D. A. Kessler, and E. Barkai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 260601 (2017).
 - [2] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics II, Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Springer, Berlin, 1985).
 - [3] L. P. Pitaevskii and E. M. Lifshitz, *Physical Kinetics*, Landau and Lifshitz Course of Theoretical Physics Vol. 10 (Pergamon Press, New York, 1981).
 - [4] D. A. Kessler, and E. Barkai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 120602 (2010).

- [5] P. Douglas, S. Bergamini, and F. Renzoni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110601 (2006).
- [6] E. Lutz and F. Renzoni, Nature Phys. **9**, 615 (2013).
- [7] P. Siegle, I. Goychuk, and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 100602 (2010).
- [8] Y. Sagi, M. Brook, I. Almog, and N. Davidson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 093002 (2012).