Lattice-depth measurement using multi-pulse atom diffraction in and beyond the weakly diffracting limit
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Precision measurement of lattice depths is important in many areas of interest in atomic physics, most notably in quantum simulation, atom interferometry and for accurate calculation of transition matrix elements. In such experiments, lattice depths are often measured by exposing an ultracold atomic gas to a series of off-resonant laser-standing-wave pulses, and fitting theoretical predictions for the fraction of atoms found in each of the allowed momentum states by time of flight measurement, after some number of pulses. We present a full analytic model for the time evolution of the atomic populations of the lowest momentum-states, which is sufficient for a weak lattice, as well as numerical simulations incorporating higher momentum states at both relatively strong and weak lattice depths. Finally, we consider the situation where the initial gas is explicitly assumed to be at a finite temperature.

I. INTRODUCTION

Precision measurement of optical lattice [1] depths is important in a broad range of fields in atomic and molecular physics [2, 3], most notably in atom interferometry [4, 5], many-body quantum physics [6, 7], accurate determination of transition matrix elements [8–12], and, by extension, ultrasensitive atomic clocks [13, 14]. A commonly used lattice depth measurement scheme is Kapitza-Dirac scattering [15], where an ultracold atomic gas is exposed to a pulsed laser standing wave and theoretical predictions for the fraction of atoms found in each of the allowed momentum states are fit to time of flight measurements to determine the lattice depth \( E_R < 0.01 \) for any atom, where \( E_R \) is the laser recoil energy, the precision on such a measurement can be hampered by signal-to-noise issues [19].

Recently, the work of Herold et al. and of Kao et al. [20, 21] has suggested that this complication can be mitigated by using multiple laser standing wave pulses, and alternating each with a free evolution-stage, both with duration equal to half the Talbot time [22–24].

The modeling approach taken in [20, 21] is valid for a weak lattice which is pulsed a small number of times, corresponding to the “weakly-diffracting limit”. In section II we describe our model system and its general time evolution. We then present a full analytic model for the time evolution of the atomic populations of the zeroth and first diffraction orders, which is sufficient for a “weak” lattice (section III), as well as numerical simulations incorporating higher momentum states at both strong (>0.1\(E_R\)) and weak lattice depths, which we compare for typical experimental values (section IV). We also explore the role of finite-temperature effects in such experiments (section V), and present our conclusions in section VI.

II. MODEL SYSTEM: BEC IN AN OPTICAL LATTICE

A. Alternating Hamiltonian evolutions

We consider a BEC with interatomic interactions neglected from the outset.\(^1\) This can be achieved experimentally by exploiting an appropriate Feshbach resonance [25–29], or by allowing the cloud to expand adiabatically [30]. Working in this regime means that we need only consider the single-particle dynamics of each atom in the gas. Further, if we neglect spontaneous emission and assume that each atom begins in the ground state, the internal degrees of freedom of the atom can be adiabatically eliminated [31], such that we need only consider the motion of the center of mass. We proceed in the same fashion as [32], and consider that the BEC is periodically perturbed by an off-resonant 1d optical lattice, alternated with a free evolution.

The center of mass dynamics of a single atom in this regime is alternatingly governed by the following Hamiltonians [32]:

\[
\hat{H}_{Latt} = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2M} - V \cos(Kx), \tag{1a}
\]

\[
\hat{H}_{Free} = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2M}, \tag{1b}
\]

where \( \hat{p} \) is the 1d momentum operator in the \( x \) direction (see Fig 1), \( \hat{x} \) is the associated position operator, \( M \) is the atomic mass, and \( V \) is the lattice depth,\(^2\) with dimensions of energy, of a lattice with wavenumber \( K \) (\( K = 2K_L \), where \( K_L \) is the laser wavenumber) [34, 35].

As stated in the introduction, the work of Herold et al. and of Kao et al. [20, 21] has suggested that the precision on the

\(^{1}\) The quantum degeneracy is not important in our analysis, as the requirement is simply for a very narrow initial momentum spread.

\(^{2}\) It is conventional to define the lattice depth with respect to a potential of the form \( U_0 \sin^2(Kx/2) \), in this work we refer to the lattice depth as \( V = -U_0/2 = -\hbar^2K^2/2\hbar^2 \) for a laser with Rabi frequency \( \Omega \) and detuning \( \Delta \equiv \omega_L - \omega_0 \).
enables us to invoke Bloch theory [45]. By recasting the momentum operator $\hat{p}$ in a basis such that:

$$ (\hbar K)^{-1} \hat{p} = \hat{k} + \hat{\beta}, \quad (3a)$$

$$ \hat{k}(\hbar K)^{-1} p = k + \beta = k(\hbar K)^{-1} p = k + \beta, \quad (3b)$$

$$ \hat{\beta}(\hbar K)^{-1} p = k + \beta = \beta(\hbar K)^{-1} p = k + \beta, \quad (3c)$$

with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ [46], we elucidate that the total dimensionless momentum $(\hbar K)^{-1} p$ associated with a single plane wave is the sum of $k$, the discrete part, and $\beta$ as the continuous part or quasimomentum, which is a conserved quantity. In other words, only momentum states separated by integer multiples of $\hbar K$ are coupled [32, 47]. We may therefore say that the system Floquet operator in a single quasimomentum subspace can be written:

$$ \hat{F}(\beta) = \hat{F}(\beta)_{\text{free}} \hat{F}(\beta)_{\text{lat}} = \exp \left( -i \left[ \frac{k^2 + 2k\beta}{2} \right] \pi \right) \times \exp \left( -i \left[ \frac{k^2 + 2k\beta}{2} - V_{\text{eff}} \cos(\theta) \right] \pi \right), \quad (4)$$

where $V_{\text{eff}} = VM/\hbar^2 K^2$ is the dimensionless lattice depth, $\hat{\theta} = \hat{K}$ and $2\pi$ is the rescaled half Talbot time.\(^3\) By using Eq. (4) to calculate $|\psi(\beta = 0)\rangle = \sum \ell \langle \ell | C_{\ell} | N \rangle$ at the population in each discrete momentum state $|k = j\rangle$ after $N$ pulses can be determined straightforwardly from the absolute square of the individual coefficients $P_j(N) = |C_{j} (N)|^2$. In this paper we employ the well-known split-step Fourier approach [32, 48], as well as matrix diagonalization in a truncated basis [20, 49] to determine $|\psi(\beta = N)\rangle$ beyond the weakly-diffracting limit, as well as an analytic approach in the weakly-diffracting case.

III. ANALYTIC RESULTS IN A TWO-STATE BASIS

For an initially zero-temperature gas ($\beta = 0$) subjected to a small number of pulses from a shallow lattice, a useful approximation is to assume that no population is diffracted into momentum states with $|p| > \hbar K$, the so-called “weakly-diffracting limit”. Mathematically, this regime corresponds to the time evolution of an initial state $|\psi(t = 0)\rangle = \psi_0$, $|N\rangle$ in a space spanned only by the $|k = -1\rangle$, $|k = 0\rangle$ and $|k = 1\rangle$ states of the $\beta = 0$ quasimomentum subspace.

The symmetry of the lattice and free evolution Hamiltonians about $|k = 0\rangle$ guarantees that for our chosen initial state, the population diffracted into the $|k = 1\rangle$ state is identical to that diffracted into the $|k = -1\rangle$ state. We take advantage of this by expressing the the system Hamiltonians (1a), (1b) as

\(^3\) Generally speaking Eq. (4) should include the operator $\hat{\beta}$, however we restrict our analysis to initial states within a single quasimomentum subspace, $\beta$ is simply a scalar value, and relative phases which depend solely on $\beta$ can be neglected.
matrices in the truncated momentum basis:

\[
|0\rangle = |k = 0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5a}
\]

\[
|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|k = 1\rangle + |k = -1\rangle) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5b}
\]

\[
|\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|k = 1\rangle - |k = -1\rangle) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5c}
\]

yielding, in the same representation, the following 3×3 matrix representation of the lattice Hamiltonian:

\[
H_{\text{3x3 Decoupled}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & -\sqrt{V_{\text{eff}}} & 0 \\ -\sqrt{V_{\text{eff}}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}
\]

By inspection, we can see that there is no coupling between the |0⟩ state, and the antisymmetric |−⟩ state, implying that for an initially zero-temperature gas there is no population transfer into the |−⟩ state for all time. The remnant basis is therefore only two-dimensional, with basis states: |0⟩₂ ≡ (0) and |+⟩₂ ≡ (1), which we may use to represent Equation (1a) as the 2×2 matrix:

\[
H_{\text{Trunc}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & -\sqrt{V_{\text{eff}}} \\ -\sqrt{V_{\text{eff}}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{7}
\]

We recognize Eq. (7) as a Rabi matrix, the eigenvalues \(E_+\) and normalized eigenvectors \(E_+\) of which are well known [50], and can be used to calculate the time evolutions of the populations of the |0⟩ and |+⟩ states \(P_0(N, V_{\text{eff}})\) and \(P_+(N, V_{\text{eff}})\) respectively, after \(N\) pulses:

\[
P_0(N, V_{\text{eff}}) = 1 - A \sin^2(N\phi/2), \tag{8a}
\]

\[
P_+(N, V_{\text{eff}}) = A \sin^2(N\phi/2), \tag{8b}
\]

\[
A = \frac{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2/2} \right)}{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2/2} \right)}, \tag{8c}
\]

\[
\phi = 2 \arctan \left( \frac{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2/2} \right)}{\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2/2} \right)} \right). \tag{8d}
\]

which are explicitly derived in appendix A.

We can see from Eqs. (8a) and (8b) that in the weakly-diffracting limit, \(P_0\) and \(P_+\) take the form of a sinusoidal oscillation with the number of pulses \(N\), entirely characterized by an amplitude \(A\) and a “frequency” \(\phi\), both of which depend on the lattice depth \(V_{\text{eff}}\) as the only free parameter. We note the similarity to the result reported in [18] for single pulse diffraction. The variation of \(A\) and of \(\phi\) versus \(V_{\text{eff}}\) is displayed in Fig. 2, where we have chosen the range \(V_{\text{eff}} \in [0, 3]\) to show the essential elements of the behaviors of each function.³⁴

From \(V_{\text{eff}} = 0\), \(\phi\) initially increases approximately linearly with \(V_{\text{eff}}\), meaning that over a sufficiently small range of lattice depths, we should expect to see an approximate uniformity in the population dynamics when the time axis is scaled by \(V_{\text{eff}}\). This scaling is explored in Section IV. The exact form of \(\phi\) in the limit where \(V_{\text{eff}} \to 0\) is \(\phi = 4 \sqrt{2} V_{\text{eff}}\) (see Appendix B), which corresponds to the red line plotted in Fig. 2(a). Further, if we substitute this result into Eq. (8b) and expand it as a Taylor series to leading order, we recover the familiar quadratic dependence of \(P_+\) on \(N\) of [20, 21] (see Appendix B 3): \(P_+ = 8N^2 V_{\text{eff}}^2 \sin^2 \phi\). This result is valid subject to the condition \(N\phi(V_{\text{eff}}/2) \ll 1\).

As \(V_{\text{eff}}\) is increased beyond this regime, \(A\), which decreases steadily in the range of linearity of \(\phi\), reaches its first node at \(V_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{3/2} \approx 0.612\), and afterward at all points where \(V_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{4m^2 - 1}/(2 \sqrt{2}), m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\), which are denoted by the vertical dashed lines of Fig 2. Physically, these values of \(V_{\text{eff}}\) correspond to a situation in which there is no pulse-to-pulse population transfer out of the |k = 0⟩ state, at least in the weakly-diffracting limit. It can be shown analytically (see appendix B), that \(\phi = \pi\) at those values of \(V_{\text{eff}}\) where \(A\) has a node, shown by the intersection of the vertical and horizontal lines of Fig 2(a).

In the limit as \(V_{\text{eff}} \to \infty\), \(\phi = \pi\) wherever \(V_{\text{eff}} = n/\sqrt{2}\), with an overall oscillatory behavior of ever-decreasing amplitude around this value, while \(A\) takes on the form of a sinusoidal

³⁴ Note that when explicitly evaluating Eq. (8d), it is desirable to use the "Atan2" numerical routine e.g. in Python, this ensures that the sign of the argument is taken into account, which avoids singularities in the frequency.
oscillation $A = \sin^2(\sqrt{2}\pi V_{\text{eff}})$, which has nodes wherever $\phi = \pi$.

IV. INCORPORATING HIGHER DIFFRACTION ORDERS

A. Numerical simulations for a large momentum basis

Having obtained analytic results for the time-evolved populations in the weakly-diffracting limit, we may test their range of validity by using standard numerical techniques to compute the full momentum distribution of the system, and sampling the population in the $|k = 0\rangle$ state, $P_0$. To that end we follow the same approach as [42, 48] and work within the momentum basis. The action of the Floquet operator (4) on the total state of the system, $|\phi\rangle$, is calculated by a split-step Fourier approach, on a basis of 2048 momentum states, which is exhaustive for any practical purpose.

The analytic results of Eqs. (8a,8b,8c,8d) are compared to this exact numerical calculation in Fig. 3 for fixed values of $V_{\text{eff}}$ (see caption for details). From Fig. 3(a) we can clearly see that for higher values of the effective lattice depth, the sinusoidal character of the analytic result for $P_0$ is revealed, as well as a similar oscillatory behavior in the exact numerics. Naively, we may say that increasing $V_{\text{eff}}$ gives rise to a greater deviation of the exact numerics from the analytics. While this is true when comparing over a fixed number of pulses, we may use our argument in section III, that there is an approximate universality in $V_{\text{eff}}$ and the number of pulses, to clarify this statement by means of the universal curve displayed in Fig. 3(b). Figure 3(b) clearly shows that the universality holds approximately for the exact numerics also, and that the analytics cease to agree with the exact numerics at approximately the same point on the universal curve, regardless of the value of $V_{\text{eff}}$ in the chosen range. We may therefore modify our previous statement on the range of validity of the analytics, and say instead that the analytics are sufficient to understand the system provided the product of the number of pulses and effective lattice depth is sufficiently small. We note specifically that there is a frequency drift which increases along the curve, and a marked reduction in amplitude of the exact numerics as compared to the analytics at the first revival of the curve. Both features appear due to leakage of population into momentum states with $|p| > \hbar K$, and inform our discussion of the range of validity of the weakly-diffracting limit taken in previous work.

In [20, 21], the regime in which the weakly-diffracting limit is satisfied is given as an inequality, $N V_{\text{eff}} \ll 1/4$, when recast in our system of variables. Though this inequality places an upper bound on the allowed value of $N V_{\text{eff}}$, it is reasonable to ask the question: “at what point is $N V_{\text{eff}}$ sufficiently small, to be considered much smaller than $1/4$?” We may answer this question by reinterpreting the inequality using our universal curve, for which $N V_{\text{eff}}$ is the dependent variable.

By inspection of Figure 3(b), we can see that at $N V_{\text{eff}} = 1/4$, there is still excellent agreement between the analytics and exact numerics. To refine this statement, we calculate the RMS difference [51] at this point over the range of chosen lattice depths (defined as $\text{RMS} = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^{N} |P_0(N, V_{\text{eff}})|^2 \right\rangle^{1/2}$).

In practice, the discretization of the time axis in the number of pulses means that we cannot generally assume that any data points from the full numerics will fall at the exact value $N V_{\text{eff}} = 1/4$, and so we have chosen the data closest to this point in our calculation of the RMS.

$P_0(\text{Numerical})(N, V_{\text{eff}})/N^{1/2}$, where $N$ is the number of lattice depth values as 0.001126 (deviation at the 0.1% level). The point at which leakage into higher momentum-states first becomes appreciable is $N V_{\text{eff}} \sim 1/2$, with an RMS of 0.004313 (deviation at the 0.4% level). Though this is clearly suffi-
FIG. 4. (Color online) Comparison between population dynamics for differing values of the effective lattice depth $V_{\text{eff}}$, as computed by exact numerics and the two-state analytic model of Eqs. (8a) and (8b). Row 1 [(a), (c), (e)] comprises momentum distributions versus the number of lattice pulses for an initially zero-temperature gas in a basis of 2048 momentum states. Each false-color plot shows the time evolved population in the first 13 momentum states ($|k| < 6$), to be read on the colorbar to the right. A cutoff population value of $P_{\text{cutoff}} = 10^{-11}$ has been applied to each population distribution to accommodate the log scale. This illustrates that for this choice of parameters, the amount of population diffracted into momentum states with $|p| > 3\hbar K$ is negligible. Row 2 [(b), (d), (f)] shows firstly, slices through the momentum distribution corresponding to the population in the $k = 0$ state, $P_0$, (red circles) and the $|p| = \hbar K$ states, $P_{\pm 1}$, (blue squares), to which our two-state analytic model is compared (red and blue solid lines respectively). To clarify the drop in amplitude in the first revival of Fig. 3(b) is almost entirely due to population leakage into the $|k| = 2$ states. At the second revival, the two sets of points are further apart. Population leakage into the $|p| = 3\hbar K$ states, corresponding to the magenta diamonds, which represent $1 - P_{\pm 1}$, explains this effect. Solid lines have been added as a guide to the eye. Each column corresponds to a fixed value of $V_{\text{eff}}$, [(a),(b)] $V_{\text{eff}} = 0.07$, [(c),(d)] $V_{\text{eff}} = 0.10$, [(e),(f)] $V_{\text{eff}} = 0.13$.

Figures 4 (a,c,e) show a selection of momentum distributions for a range of values of $V_{\text{eff}}$ as calculated by the full numerics, showing momentum states up to $|p| \leq 6\hbar K$, with Figures 4 (b,d,f) showing corresponding slices through the momentum distributions. The log scale makes clear that there is very little population leakage into momentum states with $|p| > 3\hbar K$ for the chosen values. Instead we see that there are pronounced oscillations in population between the $|p| = 0$ and $|p| = \hbar K$ states, which are modulated by population leakage into the $|p| = 2\hbar K$ states, and to a lesser extent the $|p| = 3\hbar K$ states. By inspection of the lattice Hamiltonian in the momentum basis, this can be explained by the decrease in magnitude of the off-diagonal coupling terms with state number. In fact, the decrease in amplitude at the first revival in Fig. 3(b) is almost entirely due to population leakage into the $|p| = 2\hbar K$ states, which suggests that a model incorporating only $n = 5$ momentum states should be sufficient to capture the dynamics, up to at least $V_{\text{eff}} = 1.1$. We investigate this model in the following section.

B. Small momentum bases of dimension $> 2$

To incorporate higher momentum-states we numerically diagonalize Eqs. (1a) and (1b), in a truncated basis of $n$ momentum states, and propagate the time-evolution using the procedure described in Appendix C. Our previous analysis suggests...
that simulations using a basis of \( n = 5 \) momentum states ought to be sufficient for practical purposes, the results of which are given by the hollow markers in Fig. 3(b). The five state model is an order of magnitude more accurate than the analytics at \( NV_{\text{eff}} = 1/4 \) and \( NV_{\text{eff}} = 1/2 \), with RMS differences with respect to the full numerics of 0.000184, and 0.000115 respectively. As expected, the decrease in amplitude at the second revival on the universal curve is reproduced by this approach, but is clearly also valid over a larger range, up to the fourth turning point (\( NV_{\text{eff}} \sim 1.6 \), RMS deviation 0.002255), beyond which the model begins to overestimate and then underestimate the exact numerical result.

This difference appears as a result of the basis truncation, as population leakage into states with \(|p| \geq 6 \hbar K\) is explicitly not possible in this model, though it should be noted that this effect would only be relevant to experiments performed using a very large effective lattice depth. An attractive feature of the five state model is that it can in principle be solved analytically for the time-evolution of the populations, which can be fit to experimental data to extract more accurate lattice depths.

V. FINITE-TEMPERATURE RESPONSE

The results presented in the previous sections are valid for a gas which is assumed to be initially at zero temperature; in practice this regime is never fully achieved, even for a BEC. In this section we consider the role of finite-temperature effects. To find the response of \( P_0 \) versus the number of pulses for a finite-temperature gas, we calculate the time evolution of \( P_0 \) for an ensemble of initial momentum states \( |\psi(t = 0)\rangle = |(\hbar K)^{-1} p = k + \beta\rangle \) according to Eq. (4), where the initial momentum is defined in a Bloch framework with \( k \) and \( \beta \) as free parameters. For a sufficiently cold gas [temperature \( T_w \leq \hbar^2 K^2 / (64 k_B) \)] we need only consider initial states with \( k = 0 \) in order to capture the essential features. In this regime we may choose a fixed value of the lattice depth and scan across the full range of the quasimomentum, \( \beta \), as the only free parameter, to find the momentum dependence in the first Brillouin zone [45] as displayed in Fig. 5.

Figure 5 clearly shows the central resonance at \( \beta = 0 \), where our zero-temperature analysis has been concentrated. Increasing the quasimomentum to \( |\beta| = 0.0625 \), we can see that the oscillation in \( P_0 \) has an amplitude of less than 50\% of that at \( \beta = 0 \), and a substantially different frequency. Hence, the width of the central resonance is relatively narrow compared to the full range of the Brillouin zone. We may say, therefore, that for an initial momentum distribution of appreciable width we must consider the surrounding structure when calculating the population dynamics, as the zero-temperature behavior will be washed out over time, or even be unresolvable altogether if the temperature is sufficiently high.

Note that for broader initial momentum distributions, the dynamics will include the secondary resonances at \( |\beta| = 0.5 \), which have a periodicity of the form \( P_0(N) = \cos^2(\pi V_{\text{eff}} N) \), such that \( P_0 \) varies between 0 and 1 for all \( V_{\text{eff}} \).

Having characterized the first Brillouin zone, we calculate the full finite-temperature response of \( P_0 \) by performing Gaussian weighting in the momentum space according to a rescaled Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution:

\[
D_{\text{res}}(\beta) = \frac{1}{w \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left( -\frac{\beta^2}{2w^2} \right),
\]

where the dimensionful temperature is given by \( T_w = \hbar^2 K^2 w^2 / M k_B \) [42].

Figure 6 shows the variation of \( P_0 \) with the number of pulses, including regimes of both strong and weak effective lattice depth, and three different values of the initial momentum distribution width \( w \). In overview: in regimes where we have a weak lattice and low temperature the analytic formula is adhered to almost perfectly; in regimes where we have a strong lattice and high temperature, we begin to see noticeable deviations which occur for a smaller number of pulses as the temperature is increased; in regimes where we have a strong lattice and low temperature, although the analytic for-
FIG. 6. (Color online) Plot of the finite temperature response of $P_0$ vs (number of pulses)$\times V_{\text{eff}}$, as calculated for an ensemble of 4001 particles each evolved in a basis of 2048 momentum states. The left column [(a), (b)] corresponds to the weak-lattice regime, and the right column [(c), (d)] to the strong-lattice regime. The top row of plots [(a), (c)] shows the finite-temperature response of $P_0$ at a temperature of $w = 0.00125$ for a selection of different lattice depths, $V_{\text{eff}} = 0.1, 0.2, 0.5$ in the strong regime, and $V_{\text{eff}} = 0.01, 0.02, 0.05$ in the weak regime. For the bottom row [(b), (d)], each set of curves and markers corresponds to the response of $P_0$ at a different temperature ($w = 0.125, 0.0125, 0.00125$), where the effective lattice depth is kept constant at $V_{\text{eff}} = 0.1$ in the strong-lattice case and $V_{\text{eff}} = 0.01$ the weak-lattice case. In all panels, the solid lines correspond to the exact numerical result for a given lattice depth at zero temperature, while the dashed lines represent the corresponding analytic result at zero temperature in a basis of three momentum states [Eq. (8a)].

mula is not strongly adhered to as the lattice depth increases, the oscillation frequency appears to be reasonably robust as $V_{\text{eff}}$ increases and the amplitude of oscillation consequently decreases; finally in the regime of strong lattice and higher temperature, the analytic formula is again only adhered to for relatively short times, with that time being dependent on the temperature.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have a zero-temperature analytic formula which yields significant insight assuming that we are working in the weakly-diffracting limit. We have shown that at zero temperature, very small basis sizes are sufficient to capture the essential features of the population dynamics outside the weakly-diffracting limit. We have explored the effects of finite temperature initial distributions, and elucidated regimes from which the lattice depths can be determined from the observed dynamics in the lowest diffraction order.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

B.T.B., I.G.H., and S.A.G. thank the Leverhulme Trust research programme grant RP2013-k-009, SPOCK: Scientific Properties of Complex Knots for support. We would also like to acknowledge helpful discussions with Charles S. Adams, Sebastian Blatt, Alexander Guttridge, Creston D. Herold and Andrew R. MacKellar.

Appendix A: Time evolution for 2 diffraction orders

1. Floquet operator in two-state basis

We may calculate the time evolution of the $|0\rangle$ and $|+\rangle$ state populations by first diagonalizing Eq. (7) (reproduced here for convenience)

$$H_{\text{Trunc}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{2} & -V_{\text{eff}} / \sqrt{2} \\
-V_{\text{eff}} / \sqrt{2} & 0
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A1)$$
using the well known eigenvalues and normalized eigenvectors of a Rabi matrix, \( E_\pm = (1 \pm \sqrt{1 + 8\text{V}_\text{eff}^2})/4 \), and

\[
|E_+\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha/2) \\ -\sin(\alpha/2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A2a)
\]

\[
|E_-\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \sin(\alpha/2) \\ \cos(\alpha/2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A2b)
\]

respectively, where \( \alpha = \arctan(2\sqrt{2}\text{V}_\text{eff}) \). \( H_{\text{Trunc}} \) can then be written:

\[
H_{\text{diag}} = R^\dagger H_{\text{Trunc}} R = \begin{pmatrix} E_+ & 0 \\ 0 & E_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A3)
\]

such that \( R \) is the matrix of normalized eigenvectors. This leads directly to the part of the Floquet operator governing the lattice evolution:

\[
F_{\text{Latt}} = R^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi nE_+} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi nE_-} \end{pmatrix} R. \quad (A4)
\]

Expressing \( F_{\text{Free}} \) in the truncated momentum basis, \(|0\rangle_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\); \(|+\rangle_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\), we can represent the total Floquet operator in matrix form thus:

\[
F = F_{\text{Free}} F_{\text{Latt}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} R^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi nE_+} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi nE_-} \end{pmatrix} R. \quad (A5)
\]

\[
U = S U_{\text{diag}} S^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} v_1^* & v_1^* \\ v_0^* & v_0^* \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^+ N \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1^* \\ v_0^* \end{pmatrix} \right)^\dagger = \left( \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda^+)^N v_1^* \\ (\lambda^-)^N v_0^* \end{pmatrix} \right)^\dagger. \quad (A9)
\]

Suppose that the initial state of the system can be represented by \(|0\rangle _2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\), and the excited state by \(|+\rangle_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\), the probability of the system occupying the \(|0\rangle \) state after \( N \) evolutions can be written:

\[
P_0(N) = \left| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} U^N \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 = \left| \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda^+)^N v_1^* \\ (\lambda^-)^N v_0^* \end{pmatrix} \right|^2, \quad (A10)
\]

which is the absolute square of the top-left matrix element of Eq. (A9). The corresponding probability of the system being in the \(|+\rangle \) state is simply \( P_+(N) = 1 - P_0(N) \). Since \( S \) is a unitary matrix, \( v_0^* \) and \( v_0^* \) must satisfy \( |v_0^*|^2 + |v_0^*|^2 = 1 \), using this identity and inserting Eq. (A8), \( P_0(N) \) and \( P_+(N) \) can be written:

\[
P_0(N) = 1 - 4|v_0|^2|v_0^*|^2 \sin^2(N[\theta_+ - \theta_-]/2) \quad (A11a)
\]

\[
P_+(N) = 4|v_0|^2|v_0^*|^2 \sin^2(N[\theta_+ - \theta_-]/2). \quad (A11b)
\]

By finding \( v_0 \) and \( \theta_\alpha \) for our specific Floquet operator (A5), we explicitly determine Eq. (A11a) and (A11b), in terms of the number of pulses \( N \) and the effective potential depth \( V_\text{eff} \), this is the origin of Eq. (8a) and (8b).

2. Floquet evolution for a general two-level system

Any time-evolution operator associated with a two-level system can be expressed as a \( 2 \times 2 \) unitary matrix, and all unitary matrices are diagonalizable, hence we may represent such a time-evolution operator thus:

\[
U = S U_{\text{diag}} S^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} v_1^* & v_1^* \\ v_0^* & v_0^* \end{pmatrix} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^+ & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^- \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1^* \\ v_0^* \end{pmatrix} \right)^\dagger. \quad (A6)
\]

Here \( S \) is a matrix composed of the normalized eigenvectors of \( U \):

\[
\psi_+ = \begin{pmatrix} v_1^* \\ v_0^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_- = \begin{pmatrix} v_1^* \\ v_0^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A7)
\]

and \( \lambda^\pm \) are the corresponding eigenvalues of \( U \), which have unit magnitude and so can be expressed as:

\[
\lambda^\pm = \exp(-i\theta_\alpha), \quad (A8)
\]

where \( \theta_+ \) and \( \theta_- \) are phase angles to be determined. The matrix which produces \( N \) successive evolutions can therefore be written:

\[
F = F_{\text{Free}} F_{\text{Latt}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} R^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi nE_+} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi nE_-} \end{pmatrix} R. \quad (A12)
\]

where

\[
R = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha/2) & -\sin(\alpha/2) \\ \sin(\alpha/2) & \cos(\alpha/2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A13)
\]

Introducing \( \mu_\alpha = e^{-2\pi nE_\alpha} \cos(\alpha/2) = c \) and \( \sin(\alpha/2) = s \), we can express (A5) in the more compact form:

\[
F = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu_+ c^2 - \mu_- s^2 & \mu_+ c s - \mu_- s c \\ -\mu_+ s c + \mu_- c s & \mu_+ s^2 + \mu_- c^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A14)
\]

Using \( s^2 = 1 - c^2 \) we can write (A14) as:

\[
F = \begin{pmatrix} -c^2(\mu_+ - \mu_-) - \mu_- c s + \mu_+ s c & c s(\mu_+ - \mu_-) \mu_- s^2 \\ -\mu_+ s c + \mu_- c s & \mu_+ s^2 + \mu_- c^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A15)
\]
Further, introducing the shorthand \( \overline{c}^2 \equiv c^2(\mu_+ - \mu_-) \), \( \overline{s}^2 \equiv s^2(\mu_+ - \mu_-) \), \( \overline{sc} \equiv sc(\mu_+ - \mu_-) \), we have:

\[
F = \left( \frac{-\overline{c}^2 - \mu_+}{\overline{sc}} \sqrt{\overline{c}^2 + \mu_-} \right),
\]

(A16)
the eigenvalues of which can be written:

\[
\lambda_\pm = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( c^2 - s^2 \right) \pm \sqrt{\left( c^2 - s^2 \right)^2 + 4\mu_- \left( c^2 - s^2 + \mu_- \right)} \right].
\]

(A17)

Noting that \((c^2 - s^2)^2 = (c^2 - s^2)(\mu_+ - \mu_-)^2\), and \((c^2 - s^2)^2 = 1 - 4s^2c^2\), we can simplify the argument of the radical \((c^2 - s^2)^2 + 4\mu_- (c^2 - s^2 + \mu_-) = (\mu_+ + \mu_-)^2 - 4s^2c^2(\mu_+ - \mu_-)^2\), leading to:

\[
\lambda_\pm = \frac{(\mu_+ - \mu_-)}{2} \left[ \left( c^2 - s^2 \right) \pm \sqrt{-4s^2c^2 + \left( \frac{\mu_+ + \mu_-}{\mu_+ - \mu_-} \right)^2} \right].
\]

(A18)

Recalling that \( \mu_\pm = e^{-\pm iE_\pm} \), and \( E_\pm = (1 \pm \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2})/4 \), it can be shown that

\[
(\mu_+ - \mu_-) = -\left( e^{\pm i(E_\pm - E_\mp)} - e^{-\pm i(E_\pm - E_\mp)} \right) e^{-\pm i(E_\pm + E_\mp)} = -2\sin(\pi E_\pm - E_\mp),
\]

(A19a)

\[
(\mu_+ + \mu_-) = -\left( e^{\pm i(E_\pm - E_\mp)} + e^{-\pm i(E_\pm - E_\mp)} \right) e^{-\pm i(E_\pm + E_\mp)} = -2\cos(\pi E_\pm - E_\mp),
\]

(A19b)

where we have made use of the fact that \( E_\pm + E_\mp = 1/2 \), leading to:

\[
\left( \frac{\mu_+ + \mu_-}{\mu_+ - \mu_-} \right)^2 = -\cos^2(\pi E_\pm - E_\mp) / \sin^2(\pi E_\pm - E_\mp) = -\cot^2(\pi E_\pm - E_\mp).
\]

(A20)

Since (A20) and (A19a) are always real and negative, it is straightforward to separate the eigenvalues (A18) into their real and imaginary parts:

\[
\lambda_\pm = \text{Re}(\lambda_\pm) + i\text{Im}(\lambda_\pm) = \frac{(\mu_+ - \mu_-)}{2} \left[ \left( c^2 - s^2 \right) \pm i \sqrt{4s^2c^2 + \delta^2} \right],
\]

(A21)

where we have introduced \( \delta \equiv i(\mu_+ + \mu_-) / (\mu_+ - \mu_-) \) and \( \delta^2 \equiv -(\mu_+ + \mu_-)^2 / (\mu_+ - \mu_-)^2 \). We can now solve the eigenvalue equation:

\[
F \left( \frac{v_\pm^2}{v_0^2} \right) = \frac{(\mu_+ - \mu_-)}{2} \left[ \left( c^2 - s^2 \right) \pm i \sqrt{4s^2c^2 + \delta^2} \right] \left( \frac{v_\pm^2}{v_0^2} \right),
\]

(A22)

for \( v_0^2 \), \( v_\pm^2 \). Equation (A22) leads directly to:

\[
v_\pm^2 = i \left[ \epsilon \pm \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} \right] v_0^2,
\]

(A23)

where we have introduced the shorthand \( \epsilon \equiv \mp 2\sqrt{sc} \). We can now state that:

\[
v_\pm \propto \left( i \left[ \epsilon \pm \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} \right] \right), \quad v_\mp \propto \left( i \left[ \epsilon \mp \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} \right] \right),
\]

(A24)

and noting that \( \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} = \left[ \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} + \epsilon \right]^{-1} \), we can express the normalized eigenvectors thus:

\[
v_\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} + 1}} \left( i \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} + \epsilon \right), \quad (A25a)
\]

\[
v_\mp = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} + 1}} \left( i \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} - \epsilon \right). \quad (A25b)
\]

The amplitude \( A = 4|v_0^2|^2|v_\mp^2|^2 \) can now be determined from the product of the absolute squares of the bottom entries of \( v_\pm \) and \( v_\mp \):

\[
A = \frac{4}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} + 1}} \left( \left[ \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} + \epsilon \right] \left[ \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 1} - \epsilon \right] \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 + 1}.
\]

(A26)

Inserting \( \epsilon^2 = \delta^2 / 4s^2c^2 \) and \( 4s^2c^2 = \sin^2(\alpha) = \sin^2(\arcsin(2\sqrt{2V_{\text{eff}}}/(1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2)) = 8V_{\text{eff}}^4/(1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2) \) we can express the amplitude in terms of the effective lattice-depth \( V_{\text{eff}} \):

\[
A = \frac{8V_{\text{eff}}^4 \sin^2(\pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2}/2)}{8V_{\text{eff}}^4 + \cos^2(\pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2}/2)}, \quad (A27)
\]

which corresponds to Eq. (8c). Using Eq. (A21), we can also determine the oscillation frequency \( \phi = \theta_+ - \theta_- = \arg(\lambda_+) - \arg(\lambda_-) \). We can express \( \phi \) as:

\[
\phi = \arctan \left( \frac{\text{Im}(\lambda_-)}{\text{Re}(\lambda_-)} \right) - \arctan \left( \frac{\text{Im}(\lambda_+)}{\text{Re}(\lambda_+)} \right) = 2 \arctan \left( \frac{\text{Im}(\lambda_-)}{\text{Re}(\lambda_-)} \right), \quad (A28)
\]

where we have used the relations \( \text{Re}(\lambda_-) = \text{Re}(\lambda_+) \), and \( \text{Im}(\lambda_-) = -\text{Im}(\lambda_+) \). Substituting in \( \text{Re}(\lambda_-) = -(\mu_+ + \mu_-)(c^2 - s^2)/2 \) and \( \text{Im}(\lambda_-) = -(\mu_+ - \mu_-) \sqrt{4s^2c^2 + \delta^2}/2 \) we have:

\[
\phi = 2 \arctan \left( \frac{\sqrt{4s^2c^2 + \delta^2}}{\epsilon^2 - s^2} \right), \quad (A29)
\]

which, noting that \( 4s^2c^2 = 8V_{\text{eff}}^2/(1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2) \), can be written:

\[
\phi = 2 \arctan \left( \frac{\sqrt{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2(\pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2}/2)}}{\sin(\pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2}/2)} \right),
\]

(A29)

which corresponds to Eq. (8d).
Appendix B: Limiting behaviours of Equations (8c) and (8d)

1. Weak coupling regime, \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow 0 \)

Equation (8d) can be linearized in the weak coupling regime as \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow 0 \). To clarify the procedure, we introduce the following notation:

\[
\phi = 2 \arctan \left( \frac{Y}{X} \right),
\]

\[
Y = \sqrt{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right)},
\]

\[
X = \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right).
\]

Clearly as \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow 0 \), it follows that \( Y \rightarrow \cos(\pi/2) = 0 \), \( X \rightarrow \sin(\pi/2) = 1 \), and therefore \( \phi \rightarrow 2 \arctan(0/1) = 0 \). However, we can still find an approximation to \( \phi \) that is linear in \( V_{\text{eff}} \) by means of a Taylor expansion:

\[
\phi = 2 \arctan(Z) \approx Z - \frac{Z^3}{3} + \frac{Z^5}{5} \ldots ,
\]

where \( Z = Y/X \). Hence, near \( V_{\text{eff}} = 0 \), \( \phi \) is given approximately by \( \phi \approx 2Y/X \). Note that \( \sin(\theta) = \cos(\theta - \pi/2) \), \( \cos(\theta) = -\sin(\theta - \pi/2) \), and hence

\[
\sin \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right) = \cos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 - 1} \right),
\]

\[
\cos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right) = -\sin \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 - 1} \right).
\]

The arguments of the trigonometric functions on the right hand side tend to zero as \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow 0 \), which simplifies the expansions of (B3a) and (B3b), since we can use standard small-angle approximations. We can simplify the arguments further by use of the binomial approximation \( \sqrt{1 + \epsilon} \approx 1 + \epsilon/2 \), yielding:

\[
\cos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \left[ \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 - 1} \right] \right) \approx \cos(2\pi V_{\text{eff}}^2) \approx 1 - \frac{4\pi^2 V_{\text{eff}}^4}{2},
\]

\[
\sin \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \left[ \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 - 1} \right] \right) \approx \sin(2\pi V_{\text{eff}}^2) \approx 2\pi V_{\text{eff}}^2.
\]

Hence:

\[
Y = \sqrt{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right)}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \left[ \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 - 1} \right] \right)}
\]

\[
\approx \sqrt{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + 4\pi^2 V_{\text{eff}}^4}
\]

\[
\approx 2\sqrt{2V_{\text{eff}}},
\]

\[
X = \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right) = \cos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \left[ \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 - 1} \right] \right)
\]

\[
\approx \cos(2\pi V_{\text{eff}}^2) \approx 1 - 2\pi^2 V_{\text{eff}}^4
\]

\[
\approx 1.
\]

Therefore, to leading order in \( V_{\text{eff}} \), around \( V_{\text{eff}} = 0 \)

\[
\phi \approx \frac{2 \times 2 \sqrt{2V_{\text{eff}}}}{1} = 4 \sqrt{2V_{\text{eff}}}. \quad (B7)
\]

We may follow a similar procedure for Eq. (8c), reproduced here for convenience:

\[
A = \frac{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 \sin^2 \left( \pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 / 2} \right)}{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2 \left( \pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 / 2} \right)}.
\]

Using Eqs. (B3a) and (B3b), it follows that around \( V_{\text{eff}} = 0 \),

\[
\sin^2 \left( \pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 / 2} \right) \approx 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \cos^2 \left( \pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 / 2} \right) \approx 0
\]

leading to:

\[
A \approx \frac{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 \times 1}{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + 0} \approx 1. \quad (B9)
\]

2. Strong coupling regime, \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \infty \)

To determine the behavior of \( \phi \) as \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \infty \) we first rearrange Eq. (B1b):

\[
Y = \sqrt{8V_{\text{eff}}^2 + \cos^2 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right)}
\]

\[
= 2\sqrt{2V_{\text{eff}}} \left[ 1 + \frac{\cos^2 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right)}{16V_{\text{eff}}^2} \right]. \quad (B10)
\]

Clearly, as \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \infty \), \( Y \approx 2\sqrt{2V_{\text{eff}}} \), whereas \( X = \sin(\pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2 / 2}) \) simply oscillates. Therefore, recalling Eq. (B1a), if \( X = 0 \) and \( Y > 0 \), then \( \phi = \pi \). Also, for nonzero \( X \), then as \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \infty \), \( Y \rightarrow \infty \), and therefore \( \phi \rightarrow \pi \), either from below (\( X > 0 \)) or above (\( X < 0 \)). The curve of \( \phi \) as a function of \( V_{\text{eff}} \) crosses through the line where \( \phi = \pi \) whenever \( \pi \sqrt{1 + 8V_{\text{eff}}^2} = m\pi \) for \( m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), in other words where:

\[
V_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{\frac{4m^2 - 1}{8}}, \quad (B11)
\]

or, as \( V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \infty \),

\[
V_{\text{eff}} = \frac{m}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (B12)
\]

3. Quadratic approximant to Equation (8b)

Equation (8b) can be rewritten by means of a Taylor expansion thus:

\[
P_+(N, V_{\text{eff}}) = A \sin^2(x) \approx Ax^2 - \frac{A}{3} x^4 \ldots , \quad (B13)\]
with $x \equiv N \phi / 2$, in a regime where $x \ll 1$. Further, assuming that $V_{\text{eff}}$ is near zero, we may replace $\phi$ and $A$ with our leading order approximations of Eqs. (B7,B9), with $x \approx 2 \sqrt{2} N V_{\text{eff}}$. Hence, to leading (quadratic) order in $x$:

$$P_x(N, V_{\text{eff}}) \approx 8 N^2 V_{\text{eff}}^2 \alpha N^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (B14)

which corresponds to the result used in [20, 21] where $P_x \equiv P_1$ and $V_{\text{eff}} = V_0/(16E_R) = U_0/(16E_R)$.

**Appendix C: Numerical diagonalization**

To diagonalize the lattice Hamiltonian in the zero-quasimomentum subspace, we first express Eq. (1a) in the following form:

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{\sqrt{2} K^2} \hat{H}_{\text{latt}} = \hat{H}_{\text{latt}} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2} - \frac{V_{\text{eff}}}{2} (e^{2ikx} + e^{-2ikx}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (C1)

Here $e^{2ikx}$ and $e^{-2ikx}$ are momentum displacement operators, which act on the momentum eigenkets in the following way:

$$e^{2ikx} |k = \alpha\rangle = |k = \alpha + 1\rangle, \quad e^{-2ikx} |k = \alpha\rangle = |k = \alpha - 1\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (C2)

The matrix elements of the Hamiltonian can, therefore, be expressed in the momentum basis thus:

$$\langle k = \alpha | \hat{H}_{\text{latt}} | k = \gamma \rangle = \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \delta_{\gamma,\alpha} - \frac{V_{\text{eff}}}{2} (\delta_{\gamma,\alpha-1} + \delta_{\gamma,\alpha+1})$$

$$= \frac{\gamma^2}{4} \delta_{\gamma,\alpha} - \frac{V_{\text{eff}}}{2} \delta_{\gamma,\alpha-1} + \text{H.c.}$$  \hspace{1cm} (C3)

where $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$. Equation (C3) can then be expressed in matrix form, and numerically diagonalized in order to find the time evolution of an initial momentum eigenstate.

By expressing Eq. (C3) in matrix form thus:

$$H_{\text{latt}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & -V_{\text{eff}}/2 & 0 & \ddots \\
\vdots & 0 & -V_{\text{eff}}/2 & 1/2 & \vdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots
\end{pmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} (C4)

We may now construct the matrix $H_{\text{latt}}^{\text{diag}}$ which diagonalizes $H_{\text{latt}}^{\text{diag}}$, such that $H_{\text{latt}}^{\text{diag}} = (p^\dagger)^{\text{diag}} H_{\text{latt}}^{\text{diag}} p^{\text{diag}}$. We are led to the expression:

$$|\psi(t = N)\rangle^{\text{1x1}} = [H_{\text{latt}}^{\text{diag}} (p^{\text{free}})^{\text{diag}} H_{\text{latt}}^{\text{diag}} (p^{\text{free}})^{\dagger}]^N |K = \alpha\rangle^{\text{1x1}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (C5)

for $|\psi(t = N)\rangle^{\text{1x1}}$, the time evolution due to $N$ pulse sequences of an initial eigenstate $|K = \alpha\rangle^{\text{1x1}}$, where $\alpha \in \{-(n-1)/2, (n-1)/2\}$. The $n \times 1$ superscript denotes that the ket should be understood as an $n$-dimensional column vector.
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