Survival of the quantum depletion of a condensate after release from a magnetic trap
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We present observations of quantum depletion in expanding condensates released from a harmonic trap. We confirm experimental observations of slowly-decaying tails in the far-field beyond the thermal component, consistent with the survival of the quantum depletion. Our measurements support the hypothesis that the depletion survives the expansion, and even appears stronger in the far-field than expected before release based on the Bogoliubov theory. This result is in conflict with the hydrodynamic theory which predicts that the in-situ depletion does not survive when atoms are released from a trap. Simulations of our experiment show that the depletion should indeed survive into the far field and become stronger. However, while in qualitative agreement, the final depletion observed in the experiment is much larger than in the simulation. In light of the predicted power-law decay of the momentum density, we discuss general issues inherent in characterizing power laws.

One of Bogoliubov’s seminal contributions was to recognize the Bose-Einstein condensation of collective excitations as the mechanism underlying the physics of superfluidity. The population of excited quasiparticle modes makes up the normal component in the Landau two-fluid model while the quasiparticle ground state comprises the superfluid part. The latter is composed of a macroscopically-occupied condensate and correlated particle pairs due to s-wave interactions between constituent particles. A consequence of these pairs is that excited single-particle modes are populated even at zero temperature. This is the quantum depletion of the condensate and presents as an occupation of single particle modes with large momentum that decays like $p^{-4}$.

Since the realization of atomic Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs) there has been considerable experimental and theoretical interest in the Bogoliubov theory (and quantum depletion in particular), and the intimately related thermodynamic contact and the intimately related thermodynamic contact. Tan proved to be the amplitude of the $p^{-4}$ tail. In contrast to the case of liquid helium, where the depleted fraction is large (of order 93% of the fluid) due to the strong interparticle interactions, the depletion is generally very small (less than 1%) in weakly-interacting dilute gases. Observations of the large-momentum tails thus typically employ Feshbach resonances to enhance interactions in ultracold gases and produce a depleted fraction visible with optical imaging techniques, but the power-law tails have proven elusive in this regime. A handful of theories have emerged which elucidate the role played by many-body interactions in the evolution following a quench to a large scattering length, and thus modify the momentum distribution.

However, even measurements in the weakly-interacting regime have returned unexpected results. A previous experiment reported the presence of power-law-like tails in the far-field momentum distribution after releasing a BEC of metastable helium from a harmonic optical trap. This was surprising because conventional wisdom argues that the density decreases adiabatically during expansion, motivating a hydrodynamic approximation wherein the tails are predicted to vanish. Moreover, the tails were reported to be approximately sixfold heavier than predicted by Bogoliubov theory. It is important to verify the anomaly and understand its origin because far-field measurements play a central role in the study of ultracold gases.

To this end, we measure the momentum distribution of a BEC of metastable helium (He$^*$) expanding from a harmonic trap. Our experiments cover a range of densities twice as large as the prior work and use a magnetic trap in place of an optical dipole trap, ensuring perfect spin-polarization of the atoms. We observe tails in the large-momentum part of the condensate wavefunction whose population agrees qualitatively with the predictions of the Tan and Bogoliubov theory, although a quantitative difference remains.

Our measurements are complemented by numerical simulations of the dynamics of the momentum distribution after the trap release using a Stochastic Time-Adaptive Bogoliubov (STAB) method in the positive-P framework. These show that the non-adiabatic release of the trap is responsible for survival of the depletion, and that the depleted particles acquire additional kinetic energy from the mean-field energy of the condensate during the subsequent adiabatic expansion. These factors result in an amplification of the momentum tails relative to the in situ values by a factor of up to about two, and are not captured in the hydrodynamic approximation. However, there remains a quantitative disagreement between simulation and the experiment because the experimental tails are even heavier by a large margin.

I. BACKGROUND

The Hamiltonian of a homogeneous system of interacting bosons can be written in terms of plane-wave field
operators $\hat{a}_k$, labeled by the wavevector $\mathbf{k} = p/\hbar$, as
\begin{equation}
\hat{H} = \sum_k \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k + \frac{gn}{2} \sum_{k,k',q} \hat{a}_{k+q}^\dagger \hat{a}_{k'-q}^\dagger \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_q,
\end{equation}
in terms of the particle density $n$ and the effective interaction strength $g = 4\pi \hbar^2 a^2/m$, where $a$ is the s-wave scattering length and $m$ is the atomic mass \cite{3,13}.

This Hamiltonian can be diagonalized by the Bogoliubov transformation to a free Bose gas of collective excitations through the operator transformation $\hat{b}_k^\dagger = u_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger + v_k \hat{a}_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k^\dagger$, wherein the collective excitations are superpositions of particles with opposite momenta \cite{2}. The $u_k$ and $v_k$ coefficients are given by
\begin{align}
u^2_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + \frac{gn}{\text{ilon}(k)} \right), \quad (1) \\
v^2_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + \frac{gn}{\text{ilon}(k)}, \quad (2)
\end{align}
where the denominator is the quasiparticle dispersion
\begin{equation}
\text{ilon}(k) = \sqrt{\left( \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} \right)^2 + \frac{4 \hbar^2 k^2}{m}}.
\end{equation}
In the non-interacting ($a \to 0$) limit, $u_k = 1$ and $v_k = 0$, so the transformation reduces to the identity and the dispersion is that of free particles. The occupation of single-particle momentum modes can be found using the inverse transformation and is given by
\begin{align}
\rho(k) &= \langle \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k \rangle \\
&= (u^2_1 + v^2_2) \langle \hat{b}_k^\dagger \hat{b}_k \rangle + v^2_1,
\end{align}
wherein the quasiparticle population statistics follow the canonical ensemble as $\langle \hat{b}_k^\dagger \hat{b}_k \rangle = \langle \exp(\text{ilon}(k)/k_B T) \rangle^{-1}$ \cite{3,7}. At finite temperatures, quasiparticle modes are thermally populated and deplete the condensate. Even at zero temperature, when the thermal fraction vanishes, the $v^2_1$ term in Eqn (6) persists giving a zero-temperature population of excited particles \cite{3,7,44} which decays as $\lim_{k \to \infty} \rho(k) \propto k^{-4}$ \cite{3,7,43}. Bogoliubov’s theory makes accurate predictions of the total depleted population in ultracold atomic Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs) \cite{10,12} and exciton-polariton condensates in solid substrates \cite{11}. In the case of a harmonically trapped gas, one can employ the local-density approximation (LDA) to compute the amplitude of the $k^{-4}$ tail by integrating $v^2_1$ across a Thomas-Fermi distribution \cite{7}.

The amplitude of the tails was shown by Tan to be exactly the quantity called the contact, which is proportional to the derivative of the energy with respect to the s-wave scattering length \cite{25,35}. For a Bose gas at equilibrium in a harmonic trap, the tail amplitude can be calculated using Tan’s original theorems. The two-body contact intensity is defined by \cite{25,35}
\begin{equation}
C = \lim_{k \to \infty} k^4 \rho(k),
\end{equation}
which is related to the total contact (or just contact) $C = \oint C(r) d^3r$. The contact can be derived from the total energy $E$ through the adiabatic sweep theorem \cite{36},
\begin{equation}
C = \frac{8 \pi n a^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{dE}{da}.
\end{equation}
In the Thomas-Fermi approximation, the energy of $N_0$ condensed bosonic atoms is related to the chemical potential via
\begin{equation}
E_{N_0} = \frac{5}{7} \mu = \frac{5 \hbar \bar{\omega}}{7/2} \left( \frac{15 N_0 a}{a_{HO}} \right)^{2/5},
\end{equation}
where $a_{HO} = \sqrt{\hbar/(ma)}$ is the harmonic oscillator length and $\bar{\omega} = \sqrt{\omega_x\omega_y\omega_z}$ is the geometric trapping frequency \cite{3,43}. The sweep theorem yields
\begin{equation}
C = \frac{8 \pi}{7} \left( \frac{15}{2} \langle n(k) \rangle \bar{\omega}^2 \left( \frac{m \bar{\omega}}{\hbar} \right)^6 \right)^{1/5},
\end{equation}
which can be simplified as $C = 64\pi^2 a^2 N_0 n_0/7$ by dividing out the peak density of a harmonically trapped condensate,
\begin{equation}
n_0 = \frac{1}{8\pi} \left( \frac{15N_0}{2} \left( \frac{m \bar{\omega}}{\hbar} \right)^6 \right)^{1/5}.
\end{equation}
Finally, one can compute the asymptotic momentum (density) distribution $n(k)$ of a harmonically trapped gas of spin-polarized bosonic atoms through
\begin{equation}
\lim_{k \to \infty} n(k) = \frac{C}{k^4} = \frac{64\pi^2 a^2 N_0 n_0}{7}.
\end{equation}
Note that hereon we refer to the momentum distribution $n(k)$ rather than the occupation numbers $\rho(k) = n(k)d^3k/(2\pi)^3$, and that the total number of atoms in this normalisation is $N = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3k n(k)$.

II. EXPERIMENT

Information about the momentum distribution of trapped gases is generally obtained by absorption-imaging measurements of the spatial distribution after some finite time of flight. In contrast, metastable helium experiments usually use single-particle detection after a long time of flight (hence in the far-field regime) and thus gives direct access to single-atom momentum information in three dimensions. The metastable $2^3S_1$ state of helium, denoted He*, is 19.8eV above the true ground state \cite{45} which enables the use of a multichannel electron multiplier in combination with a delay-line detector (MCP-DLD) \cite{46} for single-atom detection. Such setups have permitted the observation of many-body momentum correlations \cite{47,48} and the Hanbury Brown-Twiss effect in both condensed \cite{46,49,53} and quantum depleted atoms \cite{13}.
However, investigations of the quantum depletion in He* are challenging because the absence of a known Feshbach resonance precludes control over the contact $C \propto ((aN_0)\bar{\omega}^3)^{1/5}$ via the scattering length $a$. Given the small fixed $a = 7.512\mu m$ \cite{56}, we test the validity of Eqn. \ref{eq:3} in the far-field by varying the density of the gas, $n \propto (N_0\bar{\omega}^3)^{2/5}$ (c.f. Eqn \ref{eq:12}). To facilitate this we used two trap configurations with $(\omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z) \approx 2\pi (45, 425, 425) \text{ Hz}$ (geometric mean $\bar{\omega} = 2\pi \cdot 201 \text{ Hz}$) and $\approx 2\pi (71, 902, 895) \text{ Hz}$ ($\bar{\omega} = 2\pi \cdot 393 \text{ Hz}$) where the (weak) axis of symmetry is horizontal and the frequency is known within 1%. We varied the endpoint of the evaporative cooling ramp to adjust the number of atoms in the condensate.

Our experimental sequence, depicted schematically in Fig. 1, began with BECs consisting of between $2 \times 10^5$ and $5 \times 10^5$ $^4\text{He}$ atoms polarized in the $2^3S_1(m_J = 1)$ state and cooled to $\sim 300 \text{ nK}$ by forced evaporative cooling in a harmonic magnetic trap generated by field coils in a Bi-planar Quadrupole Ioffe configuration \cite{55}. After the trap is switched off, we transfer about one quarter of the atoms to the magnetically insensitive $m_J = 0$ state with a radio-frequency (RF) Landau-Zener sweep to avoid distortion by stray magnetic fields. We deflected the $m_J = \pm 1$ clouds outside the detector field of view with a Stern-Gerlach scheme immediately after the RF pulse by switching on a magnetic field. The centre of mass of the cloud then impacts on the detector after a $\tau = 417\text{ms}$ time of flight following the trap switch-off. We interleaved the measurements just described with calibration measurements to determine the shot-to-shot variation in atom number, trapping frequencies, magnetic state transfer efficiency, and noise contributions. The technical aspects of these calibrations are discussed later in section II.B.

A. Analysis of dilute tails

In Fig. 2 (a) we show the empirical density $n(k)$ for two data collection runs at the extreme values of $n_0$ we used. The three regimes of the condensate, thermal depletion, and quantum depletion span over five orders of magnitude in density. The thermal part of the distribution is well fitted by the momentum distribution of an ideal Bose gas \cite{56}

$$n_T(k) = \frac{N_T}{(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{\lambda_{DB}}{2\pi}\right)^3 g_{3/2} \left(\exp\left(-\frac{k^2 \lambda_{DB}^2}{4\pi}\right)\right), \quad (13)$$

wherein the thermal de Broglie wavelength $\lambda_{DB} = \sqrt{2\pi \hbar^2/(m k_B T)}$ yields an estimate of the temperature $T$ which ranges from 100 to 320 nK in our experiments. Here, $g_{3/2}(-)$ is the standard Bose integral, $\zeta(-)$ is the Riemann zeta function, and $N_T$ is the number of atoms in the thermal component. Note that for a non-interacting gas the thermodynamic limit, the number of thermal atoms is simply $N_T^0 = \zeta(3)(k_B T/\hbar \bar{\omega})^3 = \eta_T N$, but for our condensates the critical temperature is reduced by $\approx 20\%$ by interactions \cite{3,43}. We account for this and the attendant twofold increase in the thermal fraction $\eta_T$ (relative to the non-interacting case) by explicitly using $N_T$ as a fit parameter. The thermal population decays super-exponentially with $k$, and hence cannot account for the counts we observe beyond $k \geq 6 \mu m^{-1}$. In the rest of this section we present evidence in support of the identification of these counts with the quantum depletion. First, though, we show that the usual approach of a least-squares regression with a density function is unsuitable for the purpose of inferring power-law-like behaviour of the dilute tails.

1. Difficulties with analysis of power laws

A standard approach would be to proceed with a routine fit of the $k$-space histogram with an additional term of the form $C_\alpha/k^\alpha$ to estimate the parameters of the purported quantum-depleted tail. However, fitting histograms with power laws is prone to return biased estimates of parameters and to drastically under-report uncertainties, especially when data is available over less than a couple of decades of dynamic range. In this section, we demonstrate some of the problems with
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\caption{Sketch of the experimental sequence. A BEC is released from a harmonic trap (a) and expands during freefall before being split into a superposition of the $m_J \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ states (b) by an RF chirp. A magnetic field gradient separates the clouds (c) ensuring that only the magnetically insensitive $m_J = 0$ cloud lands on the detector (d), from which the momentum information is reconstructed. The quantum depletion lies in the dilute tails at large momentum (inset, solid line).}
\end{figure}
shown by dashed lines) decay super-exponentially as \(k\) of the BEC dominates. For larger \(k\), the parabolic distribution of the BEC dominates. For larger \(k\), the thermal parts (fits shown by dashed lines) decay super-exponentially as \(e^{-k^2}\).

For even larger \(k\), these give way to the depletion region. The grey dotted line is a guide to the eye showing a \(k^{-4}\) decay. In (b) we illustrate the large systematic errors in a fit to the density using a power law ansatz. If the fit in (a) is replaced by \(C_{\alpha}/k^\alpha\) and \(\alpha\) used as a fit parameter it gives a wide variation in best-fit exponents and scale coefficients between each data set (red diamonds). The red square shows the mean fitted \(C_{\alpha}\) with standard deviation (in \(\alpha\)) shown as error bars. Blue circles show the amplitude coefficient \(C_{\alpha}\) obtained from the same data sets with \(\alpha\) fixed at values within the range of the free fit results. The choice of \(\alpha\) strongly determines the coefficient \(C_{\alpha}\), but the error bars (standard errors in fit parameters) are smaller than the markers in all cases.

![FIG. 2. The empirical density (a) of particle momenta in the far field from two trap configurations (black and magenta). Three regions are shown: At low \(k\) the parabolic distribution of the BEC dominates. For larger \(k\), the thermal parts (fits shown by dashed lines) decay super-exponentially as \(e^{-k^2}\). For even larger \(k\), these give way to the depletion region. A combined fit of the form \(n_T(k) + C_4/k^4\) (green dot-dash lines) yields temperatures consistent with the thermal fit and also an amplitude \(C_4\) of the depleted tail. The grey dotted line is a guide to the eye showing a \(k^{-4}\) decay. In (b) we illustrate the large systematic errors in a fit to the density using a power law ansatz. If the fit in (a) is replaced by \(C_{\alpha}/k^\alpha\) and \(\alpha\) used as a fit parameter it gives a wide variation in best-fit exponents and scale coefficients between each data set (red diamonds). The red square shows the mean fitted \(C_{\alpha}\) with standard deviation (in \(\alpha\)) shown as error bars. Blue circles show the amplitude coefficient \(C_{\alpha}\) obtained from the same data sets with \(\alpha\) fixed at values within the range of the free fit results. The choice of \(\alpha\) strongly determines the coefficient \(C_{\alpha}\), but the error bars (standard errors in fit parameters) are smaller than the markers in all cases.

a least-squares regression using our data as a case study. Hereafter we use \(C_{\alpha}\) to refer to a fit parameter, as distinct from the total contact \(C\) computed using the sweep theorem (Eqn. [3]), and \(C_{\text{sim}}\) as determined from our numerical simulations. All three have dimensions \(m^{-1}\) like \(C\).

If we augment the thermal fit function (Eqn. [12]) with a power-law term and leave \(\alpha\) as a free parameter, the average exponent over all runs is 4.2(2). For comparison, the prior work [7] reported power-law tails with an exponent 4.2(4). At first glance, one could simply determine the amplitude of the tails by fixing the exponent to 4, and if we do so, we find an average \(C_{\alpha=4}\) which is approximately 8(2) times greater than the coefficient predicted by Eqn. [12], and in general agreement with Ref. [7]. However, there are issues which undermine the utility of this otherwise standard approach.

First, in Fig. 2 (b) we illustrate the scale coefficient \(C_{\alpha}\) depends exponentially on the choice of scaling exponent \(\alpha\) when fitting to a fixed dataset. The red diamonds in Fig. 2 (b) show the fit exponent and amplitude obtained from a fit (of the form \(n(k) = n_T(k) + C_{\alpha}/k^\alpha\)) to each data set, each representing a different BEC density. The variation in the fit exponent is small (mean 4.2, standard deviation 0.4) but the corresponding variation in fit amplitude spans over six orders of magnitude. Although the mean \(\alpha\) from the fits is only half a standard deviation (one standard-error interval) different from 4, the corresponding difference in amplitude \(C_{\alpha}\) varies exponentially with \(\alpha\). The blue circles in Fig. 2 (b) show the amplitudes returned from fits to all datasets when \(\alpha\) is constrained at one of a range of values within about one standard deviation of the mean \(\alpha\). The coefficient \(C_{\alpha}\) varies over about six orders of magnitude as \(\alpha\) varies within the range of uncertainties reported here and in the prior work [7]. These fits scarcely differ in their goodness-of-fit criterion (the mean square error) and so offer no obvious way to reconcile the expected distribution with these divergent statistical conclusions.

Furthermore, this problem is not reflected in the error estimates in the fitting routines: The error bars representing the uncertainty in parameters from the fixed-\(\alpha\) fits are smaller than the markers used in Fig. 2 (b). A linear fit reveals that \(d\log_{10} C_{\alpha}/d\alpha \approx 6.8\) It is easy to see that a well-intentioned choice of \(\alpha\), which is not statistically different from the best-fit estimates, can lead to a conclusion which either agrees perfectly or disagrees catastrophically with the predictions of Eqn. [12]. In particular if one assumes that the data conforms to a power law with \(\alpha = 4\), one is forced to conclude that the Tan theory is wrong for describing the observed high momentum tails, but the inherent uncertainty in this approach precludes the possibility of such a definitive statement.

Moreover, a deceptively reassuring result can be found by multiplying the empirical density by \(k^4\), observing a flat region, and identifying this with a \(k^{-4}\) tail. The fitting procedure would be to appropriately scale the model of the thermal region (i.e. multiply Eqn. [13] by \(k^4\)) and add a constant term to fit the tail. [59] Unfortunately this offers no recourse from the issues described above and is not a definitive test for the presence of a power law or a way to obtain its parameters. Suppose the density actually decays as \(n(k) \propto k^{-\alpha+\delta}\) with an exponent different by some \(\delta\) from the expected value. Following the rescaling operation \(n^\prime(k) = k^\delta n(k)\), one has a function which would have the form \(n^\prime(k) \propto k^{-\delta}\). Con-
considering the range of $k$ examined in this (and the prior \[7\]) work, the scaled function at the upper and lower end of the range would be predicted to differ by a factor $(k_{\text{max}}/k_{\text{min}})^{\delta} \approx 2^{0.1} \approx 1.07$. This variation is dominated by the statistical fluctuations in the tails of the individual density profiles, and so would not be distinguishable by eye (or by fit) in a plot of the scaled density.

This points to one of the primary challenges with power laws; the exponents are strongly entwined with the rate of occurrence of rare events, which by definition are subject to large statistical fluctuations and thus subvert even the most meticulous investigations.

Finally, the question of whether the data conforms to a power law at all is not amenable to a decisive conclusion. For example, a log-normal distribution can produce similarly accurate predictions to the power law \[57, 58\] even though there is no physical hypothesis that predicts such a distribution. As we discuss in the next section, this underscores the challenge of identifying power-law behaviour in range-limited data, because even with these parameters the log-normal distribution eventually diverges from the power law, albeit over far a far larger domain than available in either Helium experiment.

In sum, these problems with fitting power laws are ubiquitous, and made more difficult by the small range of $k$ which are visible in the helium experiments. In general, estimating the exponent of a purported power law is difficult and requires data spanning several orders of magnitude in scale \[57, 58, 60, 61\], which are not present in either of the helium experiments to date. The preferred statistical tools for analysing power law distributions are maximum likelihood estimators, as discussed in Refs. \[57, 58\]. However, in these particle detection experiments the limited sampling region and presence of spurious detection events (described below) mean that such estimators are not appropriate. In the next section we describe an alternative approach which does not require – and conversely cannot determine – a precise value of the scaling exponent. This approach permits a test of the Tan theory’s validity in the far-field without assuming any specific properties of (and is clear about what can and cannot be said about) the actual underlying density distribution.

2. Testing Tan’s Tails

The prediction of the high-$k$ tail shape (via Eqn. \[12\]) captures a great deal of information, which can be split into two independently testable hypotheses. The first claim which we test is that the amplitude of this tail scales in proportion to the product $n_0 N_0$, and the second is the exponent of the density decay. Under the null hypothesis that the in situ depletion survives the expansion and escapes the condensate undisturbed, one can integrate Eqn. \[12\] to predict the number of atoms whose wavevector has a modulus in the interval $k \in (k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}})$ \[62\].

\[
N_{k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}}} = \frac{C}{2\pi^2} \left( \frac{1}{k_{\text{min}}} - \frac{1}{k_{\text{max}}} \right) \tag{14}
\]

For fixed $k_{\text{min}}$ and $k_{\text{max}}$, Eqn. \[14\] has the form

\[
N_{k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}}} = \Lambda N_0 n_0 \tag{15}
\]

(c.f. Eqn. \[12\]). We can test this form directly by measuring the number of counts detected in the interval $(k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}})$ after producing a BEC of $N_0$ atoms with peak density $n_0$. The figure of merit for this description will be the goodness of fit of a simple linear regression.
As above, we choose $k_{\text{min}} = 6 \, \mu m^{-1}$ which lies outside the thermal part for all our data sets (see Fig. 2 a). However, the $k$-space field of view is restricted by the detector radius to $k \lesssim 5 \times 10^6 \, m^{-1}$ in the $(x, y)$ plane, which is only just sufficient to reach past the edge of the thermal region. We thus face a tradeoff in the choice of $k_{\text{max}}$, therefore we define the bounds of our region of interest (ROI) by the minimum elevation angle $\phi_e = \pi/3 \, \text{rad}$ above the $(x, y)$ plane and an upper bound of $k_{\text{max}} = 10 \mu m^{-1}$. This amounts to an ROI consisting of two vertically oriented conical sections, each with half-angle $\pi/6$ from the $z$ axis, encompassing a total solid angle of $0.13 \times 4\pi \, \text{steradians}$. We must also account for the detector quantum efficiency of 0.08(2) and state-transfer efficiency of 25(2)%, and combine all these factors into the total efficiency $\eta_{\text{det}} \approx 0.23(5)\%$. After we discuss the results of this analysis, we will examine the (lack of) effect of uncertainty in $\eta_{\text{det}}$ and the choice of $\phi_e$.

A linear fit of the form $\tilde{N}_{k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}}} = \Lambda_{\text{fit}} n_0 N_0 + \beta$ yields an intercept consistent with zero ($\beta = -0.9$, 95% CI [-3.1, 1.2]) and a good correlation ($r^2 \approx 0.8$, $p = 1 \times 10^{-3}$), providing evidence supporting the expected linear relationship. The correlation coefficient between the variables $N_{k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}}}$ and $N_{\text{det}} n_0 \propto (N_0^3 \omega^9)^{1/5}$ is 0.9. We conclude that the product $N_{\text{det}} n_0$ is a predictor of the depleted population, which is consistent with Eqn. 12. We tested other combinations of the independent variables and found no physically-motivated combination provides a better fit. For a linear fit, proves that the atom number $N$ itself is a poor predictor of the detected number ($r^2 = 0.05$, $p = 0.54$), as is the density $n_0$ alone ($r^2 = 0.4$, $p = 0.04$).

The gradient $\Lambda_{\text{fit}}$ is of particular interest because it can be predicted using Eqn. 14. Given an ROI, one can calculate $\Lambda_{\text{pred}} = 32 n_0 a^2 (k_{\text{min}} - k_{\text{max}})/\gamma$. We find that the predicted slope disagrees with the empirical fit by a factor of $\Lambda_{\text{fit}}/\Lambda_{\text{pred}} = 8.3$, 95% CI (5.5, 11).

We are then tasked with reconciling the nonlinear scaling of the detected counts, which is consistent with the quantum depletion, and the disagreement over the absolute number of detected counts. We may look to understand the disagreement in terms of the deviation from Eqn. 12. We focus two simple alternatives: whether the tail amplitude is simply larger than expected (i.e. $n(k) = AC/k^4$), or whether the tail decay is somehow modified (i.e. $n(k) = C/k^{4+\delta}$). The former would imply that the derivation using the sweep theorem (or Bogoliubov theory in a local density approximation 7) misses something essential about the system. The latter could be due to some physical effect, either analogous to the prethermal dynamics of unitary gases [8, 9, 20, 22] or, as discussed in later sections, modifications of the momentum distribution by interactions with the mean-field potential.

Ultimately, it turns out that such a distinction between these hypotheses is not possible given the data at hand. Specifically, the density profiles $n(k) = AC/k^4$ with $A = 8(3)$ and $n(k) = C/k^{4+\delta}$ with $\delta = 3.86(2)$ both predict the variation of $\Lambda_{\text{pred}}$ with $k_{\text{min}}$ and $k_{\text{max}}$ with comparable accuracy, as shown in Fig. 3 (b,c). Note that the difference in precision of the parameters $A$ and $\alpha$ here is due to the exponential relationship between the two as previously discussed. It is thus not possible to tell whether we have a tail with the expected exponent but a greater amplitude, or the correct amplitude but a slower decay, or some combination of the two, or indeed another form altogether. Fig. 3 (b,c) shows, in red, predictions obtained by assuming log-normally distributed $k$ with parameters $(\mu, \sigma) \approx (1.235, 0.95)$ and normalized to the relevant amplitude. The predictions are essentially identical over the ROI and so we can conclude only that the data is consistent with (a range of) power-law distributions, not that it is drawn from a power law. Without the ability to precisely determine the exponent $\alpha$, or whether a power-law is present at all, there is insufficient evidence to conclude which of these is correct, and therefore little can be said with certainty about which aspect of Eqn. 12 is incorrect or what physical effects might underpin this disagreement. Indeed, the predicted $k^{-4}$ behaviour is only a strict constraint inasmuch as it can be shown to persist (exactly) after the expansion, which as we argued above is not demonstrable, and argue below is not necessarily expected. Ultimately, as we detail in the Discussion (section IV), the most prudent way through this dilemma is via alternative experimental designs.

One conclusion remains robust: There are almost about ten times as many detections in the depletion region as one would expect based on the Tan theory in situ. Later in this section we provide technical details of our experiments and rule out several systematic factors which could lead to this disagreement.

Nonetheless, the particular nonlinear scaling of detected counts with the predictor $N_{\text{det}} n_0$ is concordant with the tails’ originating in the quantum depletion. Furthermore, our simulations indicate that the quantum depletion can survive the condensate expansion, presenting depleted tails in the far-field with modified amplitude. We are therefore faced with the conclusion that tails are indeed a signature of quantum depletion, albeit subject to some effect during expansion into which the present analysis can see no further. In order to find more insight into this observation, we performed numerical simulations of the time-dependent evolution of the expanding condensate, which we describe in section III. In the remainder of this section, we provide details about the experimental method which yielded the data discussed above.

### B. Experimental details

#### 1. Trap configuration

We prepared our BECs with via forced evanescent cooling in a harmonic magnetic trap with trap frequencies $\approx (45, 425, 425) \, Hz$ and a DC bias stabilized by our auxiliary field compensation coils 55. For the tight
trap we increased the coil current after the cooling sequence to obtain trapping frequencies \( \approx (71,902,895) \) Hz, ramping the current as a sigmoid step function to minimize in-trap oscillations. Note that the weak \((x)\) axis of the trap is horizontal, with tight vertical confinement. The trap was switched off with a \(1/e\) time of \(\approx 38\mu s\). The condensates were allowed to expand for 2ms before we transferred some of the initial \(m_J = 1\) condensate into the magnetically insensitive \(m_J = 0\) state via a Landau-Zener sweep to preserve it against distortion by stray magnetic fields during the free fall to the detector. The RF pulse was created by a function generator, amplified, and applied to the experiment chamber by a coiled antenna inserted into the BiQUIC coil housing. The pulse swept from 1.6-2.6MHz over 1ms and was centred on the resonance between the \(m_J\) states. The determination of the transfer efficiencies \(\eta_J\) for each of the \(m_J\) states is discussed below. The sweep was \(10^6\)-fold wider than the RF width of the BEC which ensured uniform transfer at all momenta. Immediately after the RF sweep, the bias coils are switched off and auxiliary push coils in the vertical (\(Z\)) and weak horizontal (\(X\)) axes are activated using a fast MOSFET switch to implement a Stern-Gerlach separation of the \(m_J = -1, 0, \) and \(+1\) pulses.

We use a Roentdek DLD80 multichannel plate and delay-line detector stack [46] located 848nm below the trap, which registers the arrival times and positions \((t_i, x_i, y_i)\) of each atom, indexed by \(i\). The velocity of each atom relative to the centre of mass of each cloud is calculated by \(\bar{v}_i(t) = \frac{1}{2}g_0(t^2 - t^2_{\text{cen}})\)

where \(g_0\) is the local gravitational acceleration, the overbar denotes the within-shot average and \(t_{\text{cen}}\) is the time of flight of the centre of mass of the cloud. The far-field momentum is thus obtained via \(mv = \hbar \bar{k}\). The velocity conversion assumes a point source but carries a negligible error as the in-trap BEC size is smaller than the detector resolution. The space and time resolution of the detector are 100 \(\mu m\) and 3 \(\mu s\), respectively [64], and the detector efficiency of 8(2)% was determined from analysis of the squeezing parameter of correlated atoms on the opposite sides of scattering halos [65][67].

The dominant uncertainty in the collection efficiency \(\text{ilon}\) is the 25% error in the detector quantum efficiency (QE), whereas the other factors (cutoff angle \(\phi_c\) and transfer efficiency \(\eta_0\)) are more precisely known. We performed the analysis described above for a range of \(\phi_c\) and values of the QE and found that the excess of counts (expressed as \(\Lambda_{\text{fit}}/\Lambda_{\text{pred}}\)) was not significantly affected, which we summarize in Table I.

2. Peak density calibration

The quantum depletion and contact are both predicted to depend solely on the condensed number and trapping frequencies via the condensate density, hence it is important to determine both quantities accurately. The sole experimental parameters in the expression for the peak density (Eqn. [11]) are the geometric trap frequency \(\bar{\omega} = (\omega_x \cdot \omega_y \cdot \omega_z)\) and \(N_0\), the number of atoms in the condensate. We simultaneously determine the total atom number \(N\) and trap frequency \(\bar{\omega}\) in a single shot using a pulsed atom laser and use the thermal fraction \(\eta_T\) (section [11][3]) to determine the condensed number \(N_0 = (1 - \eta_T)N\).

The pulsed atom laser consists of a series of Fourier-broadened RF pulses centred on the minimum Zeeman splitting in the trap. The pulse transfers atoms in the trap to the untrapped \(m_J = 0\) state with an approximately constant transfer rate across the cloud [46][63]. We outcouple approximately 2% of the atoms per 100 \(\mu s\) pulse for \(\approx 200\) pulses, which eventually depletes the entire trap. The atom laser thus prevents the detector from saturating and allows an accurate determination of the atom number, up to a factor of the quantum efficiency. We determine the trapping frequencies by inducing centre-of-mass oscillations with a magnetic impulse, and find the oscillation period from the atom laser pulses [68].

3. Determining spin transfer efficiency

To calibrate the transfer efficiencies, we applied a weaker Stern-Gerlach than for the depletion measurement, such that each \(m_J\) cloud hits detector at different times (and positions), as illustrated in Fig. 4.

The efficiencies \(\eta_J\) cannot be calculated by counting the atoms in each cloud. Although the detector sat-

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{QE} & \text{fit} & r^2 & \Lambda_{\text{fit}}/\Lambda_{\text{pred}} \\
0.05 & 0.83 & 0.2(0.1,0.3) & 6.8(4.5,9.1) \\
0.06 & 0.83 & 0.3(0.2,0.4) & 7.4(4.9,9.8) \\
0.07 & 0.83 & 0.3(0.2,0.4) & 7.8(5.2,10.5) \\
0.08 & 0.83 & 0.4(0.3,0.5) & 8.3(5.5,11) \\
0.09 & 0.83 & 0.5(0.3,0.6) & 8.7(5.8,11.6) \\
0.1 & 0.83 & 0.6(0.4,0.7) & 9.0(6.0,12.1) \\
0.11 & 0.83 & 0.6(0.4,0.8) & 9.4(6.2,12.5) \\
\phi_c & \text{fit} & r^2 & \Lambda_{\text{fit}}/\Lambda_{\text{pred}} \\
80^\circ & 0.82 & 0.1(0.0,0.1) & 9.3(6.0,12.7) \\
70^\circ & 0.86 & 0.2(0.1,0.3) & 9.2(6.4,12) \\
60^\circ & 0.83 & 0.4(0.3,0.5) & 8.3(5.5,11) \\
\end{array}
\]

TABLE I. Neither the uncertainty in the collection efficiency nor the choice of elevation angle cutoff \(\phi_c\) have a significant effect on the findings. A change in quantum efficiency (QE) presents by changing the value of \(\text{ilon}\) used in the prediction and also through the factor of \(N_0^2/\bar{\omega}\) used to compute the condensate density \(n_0\). These effects partially cancel to produce a weak scaling of \(\Lambda_{\text{fit}}/\Lambda_{\text{pred}}\) with respect to \(\text{ilton}\). Re-running the analysis using different QE yields fits that barely differ in the goodness-of-fit criterion and present comparable results for \(\Lambda_{\text{fit}}\). We also find that the choice of collection area defined by the elevation angle cutoff \(\phi_c\) has a weak effect on the result, but below statistical significance. Terms in brackets are the upper and lower 95% confidence intervals.
urates during the peak condensate flux, we can compare the thermal parts. We align each cloud along the time (Z) axis and compute the pointwise fraction of the atomic flux \(\phi(t)\) accounted for by each cloud, \(\eta_j(t) = \phi_j(t)/\sum \phi_j(t)\), as depicted in Fig. 4 (a-c). The ratio of densities between the clouds is roughly constant in the thermal part (Fig. 4 (c)), indicating the absence of saturation effects in the thermal part and a spin transfer efficiency that is independent of \(k\). The fraction of the original cloud transferred into each \(m_J\) state is determined by taking the average \(\langle \eta_j(t) \rangle\) over the thermal tails. We find these efficiencies are approximately 74\%, 24\%, and 2\% in all runs for the \(m_J = +1, 0, \) and -1 states, respectively.

While the \(m_J = 0\) and \(m_J = 1\) clouds clearly saturate the detector, the small fraction (\(\approx 2\%\)) of the atoms transferred to the \(m_J = -1\) state does not (Fig. 4 (d)). A bimodal fit to the condensed and thermal parts, plus constant background, yields the thermal fraction \(\eta_T\) and condensed fraction \(1 - \eta_T\).

4. Noise sources

In early tests of our measurement sequence we noticed a contamination of the signal by spurious counts. We inferred these were remnants from the \(m_J = +1\) cloud as they were still visible when we ran an experimental sequence without the Landau-Zener transfer. This contamination appeared in a particular region of our detection image, and as such we were able to correct for it by subtracting their contribution from the counts collected during measurement shots. While the cause of the cross-contamination is unclear, we observe that the count density outside the region of interest is similar in both the shots with the RF pulse and those without. We hypothesize that the remnant counts are atoms transferred into the \(m_J = 0\) state by non-ideal behaviour of the Stern-Gerlach pulses or magnetic field switches. We note that only about one in a million atoms from the \(m_J = 1\) cloud are present in this manner in a given shot. Such counts constitute about 10(5\%) of the detection events in the ROI. The calibration without the Landau-Zener transfer enables us to correct for their contribution by subtracting the counts measured in the calibration runs from the total used in Sec II A 2. However, because it is not possible to distinguish which individual atoms are spurious and which are genuine quantum-depleted particles, the preferred power-law analysis (the maximum-likelihood estimator) is not available. Basic MLEs are built assuming one has a sample of data drawn from a single category; the probabilistic combination of two indistinguishable categories of events falls outside the scope of this framework.

III. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In order to understand whether any depletion could survive the expansion and to investigate what effects are taking place during the initial release, we performed simulations of the BEC expansion from harmonic traps using the first principles STAB method \[33, 42\]. The simulations started from a cigar-shaped trap with parameters matched to the experimental conditions. The in-trap state before release from the trap at time \(t = 0\) (marked CT in Fig. 5 (a)) was consistent with the adiabatic sweep theorem. Following expansion from the cigar trap, the simulated tail amplitude increased and stabilized within a few hundred microseconds (CE in Fig. 5 (a)), much sooner than the 2ms delay between the trap release and application of the rf and Stern-Gerlach pulses. Fig. 5 (b) shows the time evolution of the tail amplitude \(C_{\text{sim}}\) extracted from a \(n(k) = C_{\text{sim}}/k^4\) fit to the simulated density using an ROI with the same cutoff elevation angle \(\phi_c = \pi/3\) as in the experiment. In this configuration the steady-state value of the momentum tails was a factor of 1.64(9) above the predictions of Eqn. (12). An analysis of the occupation of the tails according to \(\langle 14 \rangle\), gives very similar factors \(A_{\text{sim}}\) for the increase in the strength of the tails (relative to in-situ predictions) during evolution, as shown in Table II.

To understand the disagreement with earlier theory \[23\], which predicted no depletion survival, we also investigated the effect of adiabatic expansion on the in-trap depletion by simulating a slow decrease of the transverse trapping frequencies by a factor of two (CS), and found that the in-trap contact \(C_{\text{sim}}\) as well as the tail strength \(N_{\text{sim}, k_{\text{max}}}\) from \(\langle 14 \rangle\) decreased roughly as predicted by Eqn. (12) in these instances — see the dashed line in Fig. 5 (b) and Table II. We also found that the relative factors between Eqn. \(\langle 14 \rangle\) and the simulated...
tails (i.e. $C_{\text{sim}}/C$ and $A_{\text{sim}}$) depend on choice of cut-off angle $\phi_c$. We find that apparent tail strengths $C_{\text{sim}}$ and $A_{\text{sim}}$ are larger for smaller collection regions that are more tightly concentrated about the strong trapping axis, whereas larger collection angles (that include areas closer to the weak axis) produce lower apparent tail strengths. Data on $A_{\text{sim}}$ are shown in Table II while $C_{\text{sim}}$ was 1.6(1), 1.9(2), and 2.2(3) times $C$ for $\phi_c$ values of 60, 70, and 80 degrees, respectively. We note that the experimental results (Tab. I) could be said to display a similar trend, but the result is not statistically significant. The remainder of this section details the implementation of the simulations.

![FIG. 5. Simulations of release from the trap. (a) Steady-state values of the simulated contact. Simulations of condensates released from a cigar-shaped trap (CT) are consistent with the Tan theory (TT) before release, and show an increase in contact after the trap release (CE). A slow relaxation of the transverse trapping frequencies (CS) shows a decrease in line with the predicted value of the lower density. Spherical traps (ST,SE) lack any directions of tight confinement, wherein a longer interaction time prevents the escape of depleted particles as seen in cigar traps. (b) the time-dependence of the contact stabilizes after a time on the order of $1/\omega_\perp$, several hundred $\mu$s. The expanded contact is consistently about 1.7 times the Tan theory. For comparison, the experimental control pulses are implemented after 2ms of expansion. When the transverse trapping frequencies are slowly reduced by half (dotted line), the in-situ contact relaxes.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_0N$</th>
<th>$k_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$k_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>$\phi_c$</th>
<th>$N_{k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}}}$</th>
<th>ratio $A_{\text{sim}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10^6 \mu m^{-3}$</td>
<td>(\mu m^{-1})</td>
<td>(deg)</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>final/in situ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid release from trap (CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.237(16)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>193(8)</td>
<td>1.38(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.09(6)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>362(10)</td>
<td>1.43(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.86(3)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>163(4)</td>
<td>1.45(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.90(8)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>423(8)</td>
<td>1.37(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.90(8)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>408(8)</td>
<td>1.56(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.90(8)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>368(7)</td>
<td>1.80(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.90(8)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>282(6)</td>
<td>2.00(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.90(8)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>157(5)</td>
<td>2.19(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid release, spherical (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.35(2)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120(9)</td>
<td>0.92(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.23(6)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>256(11)</td>
<td>1.05(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.38(10)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>232(10)</td>
<td>1.10(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow ramp down of trap (CS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.237(16)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>193(8)</td>
<td>0.37(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.09(6)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>103(21)</td>
<td>0.31(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.86(3)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50(8)</td>
<td>0.34(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.90(0)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>181(14)</td>
<td>0.54(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# TABLE II. Tail strength data in simulations. Based on final times in the simulations described in Table III, referenced by the value of $n_0N$. $N_{k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}}}$ is calculated as per (14). The ratio $A_{\text{sim}}$ of tail strength in the expanded cloud compared to Tan theory predictions is obtained by dividing $N_{k_{\text{min}}, k_{\text{max}}}$ at the final time by its value in situ at $t=0$. $k_{\text{max}}$ is chosen to still contain all $4\pi$ steradians inside the square lattice, while $k_{\text{min}}$ to avoid overlap with the expanding condensate.

A. Evolution

The STAB method (stochastic Time-Adaptive Bogoliubov) \cite{33, 42} uses the positive-P representation \cite{69, 70} to describe Bogoliubov quasiparticles around a dynamically evolving condensate \cite{32}. This allows for straightforward treatment of inhomogenous and evolving condensates with their associated quantum depletion, without the need to diagonalise the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations. The systems considered here require $4 \times 6 \times 10^6$ modes for simulation, so avoiding diagonalisation is very relevant.

Previous use of the STAB method \cite{33, 42, 67, 71, 75} has been according to the equations described in detail in \cite{33} which relied on a separation of the condensate and Bogoliubov quasiparticles in k-space that arose from initial conditions and system dynamics. Here this does not occur, and there is a significant overlap in momentum space. The standard STAB formulation leads to an unphysical amplification of the part of the Bogoliubov field that overlaps with the condensate. Therefore a theory that explicitly imposes orthogonality between condensate and Bogoliubov modes is required. We summarise it below, while details of the derivation and proper benchmarking of the method will be reported in \cite{76}.

In terms of operators, the Bose field of the atoms
\( \hat{\Psi}(x, t) \) is written as

\[
\hat{\Psi}(x, t) = \phi(x, t) + \hat{\Psi}_B(x, t),
\] (16)

where \( \phi(x, t) \) is the condensate order parameter described in 3-dimensional space \( x \), and \( \hat{\Psi}_B(x, t) \) is a relatively small operator fluctuation field. The smallness requirement can be written

\[
N = \int d^3x \ |\phi(x, t)|^2
\] (17)
\[
\gg \int d^3x \ 〈 \hat{\Psi}_B^\dagger(x, t)\hat{\Psi}_B(x, t) 〉 = N_B = N\delta_B, \quad \text{(18)}
\]
i.e. \( N_B \) the number of particles in the Bogoliubov field is small overall, but locally the Bogoliubov field density need not be smaller then the condensate – as verified e.g. in [32]. The condition [18] allows one to discard third and higher orders of \( \hat{\Psi}_B \) in the effective Hamiltonian (the Bogoliubov approximation). A second condition, not applied in standard STAB, is

\[
\int d^3x \ 〈 \hat{\Psi}_B^\dagger(x, t)\phi(x, t) 〉 = 0. \quad \text{(19)}
\]

which imposes orthogonality and prevents seeping of condensate atoms into the fluctuation field \( \hat{\Psi}_B(x, t) \).

The condensate order parameter \( \phi(x, t) \) is assumed to evolve according to the Gross-Pitaevskii equation (correct to leading order, given [18]):

\[
i\hbar \frac{d\phi}{dt} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + g|\phi|^2 + V(x, t) \right] \phi. \quad \text{(20)}
\]

and is normalised to the (conserved) total number of particles \( \int d^3x \ |\phi(x, t)|^2 = N \). The \( g = 4\pi\hbar^2a_{1,1}/m \) is the s-wave contact interaction between He\(^*\) atoms in the initial \( m_f = 1 \) state (we take \( a_{1,1} = 7.51 \text{nm} \)), and \( V(x, t) \) is the trap potential with in general time-dependent frequency. We then represent the Bogoliubov quasiparticles using the positive-P representation [33-69], which gives the following equations of motion for the ket \( \psi_B(x, t) \) and bra \( \bar{\psi}_B(x, t) \) amplitudes of the quasiparticles:

\[
\begin{align*}
\hbar \frac{d\psi_B}{dt} &= \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + g|\phi|^2 + V(x, t) \right] \psi_B + \mathcal{P}_\perp \left\{ g|\phi|^2\psi_B + g\phi^2\bar{\psi}_B^\dagger + \sqrt{-i\hbar} g \phi \xi(x, t) \right\} \quad \text{(21a)} \\
\hbar \frac{d\bar{\psi}_B}{dt} &= \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + g|\phi|^2 + V(x, t) \right] \bar{\psi}_B + \mathcal{P}_\perp \left\{ g|\phi|^2\bar{\psi}_B + g\phi^2\psi_B^\dagger + \sqrt{-i\hbar} g \bar{\phi} \xi(x, t) \right\}. \quad \text{(21b)}
\end{align*}
\]

Here the ket \( \psi_B(x, t) \) and bra \( \bar{\psi}_B(x, t) \) amplitudes provide the positive-P representation of the Bogoliubov field in 3D space. We used the robust stochastic integration procedure described in [72]. The \( \xi(x, t) \) and \( \bar{\xi}(x, t) \) are independent white Gaussian noise fields of zero mean and variance:

\[
〈 \xi(x, t)\xi(x', t') 〉 = 〈 \bar{\xi}(x, t)\bar{\xi}(x', t') 〉 = \delta^3(x - x')\delta(t - t'). \quad \text{(22)}
\]

An ensemble of field trajectories with independent noise in each trajectory and in each trajectory’s initial state is generated to represent the Bogoliubov field. We typically used \( S = 4000 \) trajectories.

Notably, the equations [21] allow not only for production of additional Bogoliubov quasiparticles quantum depleted from the condensate but also for their reabsorption.

The main additional element in [21] compared to the standard STAB equations [72] is the projection \( \mathcal{P}_\perp \) which imposes the orthogonality requirement [19] and avoids the aforementioned amplification of the Bogoliubov field where it overlaps with the condensate. The projection \( \mathcal{P}_\perp \) of a field \( f(x) \) can be carried out efficiently by

\[
\mathcal{P}_\perp f(x) = f(x) - \frac{1}{N} \left[ \int d^3x \ \phi(x)^\ast f(x) \right] \phi(x). \quad \text{(24)}
\]

The kinetic part of the evolution equations [20]-[21] is also carried out efficiently by a split-step approach which evaluates kinetic terms in k-space and the rest in x-space, moving between k-space and x-space using a fast Fourier transform.

The total quantum depletion of the condensate \( \delta_B \) is given by

\[
\delta_B = \frac{N_B}{N} = \frac{1}{N} \int d^3x \left( \left\langle \text{Re} \left[ \psi_B(x, t)\bar{\psi}_B^\dagger(x, t) \right] \right\rangle \right)_{\text{stoch}}. \quad \text{(25)}
\]

Stochastic averaging over all trajectories in the ensemble is denoted by \( \left\langle \cdot \right\rangle_{\text{stoch}}. \) The density of the depleted particles is evaluated by the standard positive-P expression,

\[
n_B(k) = \left\langle \bar{\psi}_B^\dagger(k, t)\psi_B(k, t) \right\rangle \quad \text{(26)}
\]

\[
= \text{Re} \left( \bar{\psi}_B^\dagger(k, t)\psi_B(k, t) \right)_{\text{stoch}}. \quad \text{(27)}
\]

The density of condensate

\[
n_{\text{BEC}}(k) = (1 - \delta_B) |\phi(k, t)|^2, \quad \text{(28)}
\]
is augmented by the \( 1 - \delta_B \) factor when calculating observables to conserve overall particle number. The k-
space fields here are normalised as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{\psi}_B(k) \\
\phi_B(k)
\end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int d^3x \ e^{-ikx} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{\psi}_B(x) \\
\phi_B(x)
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(29)

B. Initial condition

Our simulations aim to study the evolution of the quantum depletion particles in \(\hat{\psi}_B\) after release from the trap. We use a zero temperature initial condition, since the object is to study the behaviour of the high momentum tails beyond the edge of the thermal cloud. The \(T = 0\) initial state is more straightforward to obtain, and also allows us to use lower \(k\)-values to access the \(k^{-4}\) tails, since they are not obscured by the stronger thermal cloud at intermediate momenta. This significantly reduces the size of the computational lattice needed. For the low temperatures in the experiment we do not expect any significant interaction between the behavior of the thermal cloud and the depleted atoms because both are well approximated by the Bogoliubov Hamiltonian which neglects interactions between excited modes. Therefore the neglect of the thermal cloud does not significantly affect the properties of the higher \(k\) depletion or its evolution.

However, one cannot use the standard Gross-Pitaevskii ground state since that has 100% condensate and no quantum depletion. The task of generating a cloud with the appropriate depletion in such a large nonuniform system turns out to be nontrivial. Conceptually the issue is simple – diagonalise the Bogoliubov Hamiltonian, and eliminate the main oscillations in the mean-field evolution – that there are more particles than modes – is very far from being met \[23, 24, 23] (In fact here we have about \(O(1000)\) particles in the depletion, and \(O(10^6)\) modes.). It is also unclear how to translate a local density formulation of depletion in a uniform section of gas to a positive-P ensemble without introducing discontinuities. Instead we turned to dynamically generating a state with the required quantum depletion.

We begin with a fully condensed ground state with \(\psi_B = \psi_B = 0\) and \(\phi(x) = \phi_0(x)\), the ground state of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation \[20]. The latter is obtained by imaginary time propagation of the GPE augmented with an appropriately chosen chemical potential \(\mu\) according to \[9\] which sets the central density.

Our first attempt to generate the equilibrated quantum depleted state thus started with \(\phi_0(x)\) and then adiabatically ramped the interaction from \(g = 0\) to the experimental value while evolving the equations \[20, 21\]. This did not work for two reasons. Firstly, a very strong collective oscillation was induced, since the width of the Thomas-Fermi ground state depends strongly on \(g\). Secondly, very long time evolutions succumb to excessive noise in the positive-P simulation and produce a state that is too noisy to be useful. Note that in the positive-P representation different ensembles can represent the same state but exhibit very different noisiness and practical usefulness \[81\].

The second attempt began with the Gross-Pitaevskii ground state and the physical interaction strength \(g\) in the GPE \[20\], while slowly ramping the interaction strength in the Bogoliubov equations \[21\]. This eliminates the main oscillations in the mean-field evolution. The least unwanted nonadiabatic disturbance occurs when \(g\) is ramped only within the projected part of the Bogoliubov evolution as per

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{i\hbar}{dt} \frac{d\phi}{dt} &= \mathcal{H}(g, \phi) \phi = 20 \\
\frac{i\hbar}{dt} \frac{d\psi_B}{dt} &= \mathcal{H}(g, \phi) \psi_B + \mathcal{P}_\perp \left\{ g_B|\phi|^2 \psi_B + g_B \phi^2 \psi_B^* + \sqrt{-1g_B} \phi \xi(x, t) \right\} \\
\frac{i\hbar}{dt} \frac{d\bar{\psi}_B}{dt} &= \mathcal{H}(g, \phi) \bar{\psi}_B + \mathcal{P}_\perp \left\{ g_B|\phi|^2 \bar{\psi}_B + g_B \phi^2 \bar{\psi}_B^* + \sqrt{-1g_B} \phi \bar{\xi}(x, t) \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]  

(30a, 30b, 30c)

with \(g_B(t)\). However, over adiabatic timescales, this still introduced far too much noise in the Bogoliubov fields \(\psi_B, \bar{\psi}_B\) to be useful.

To work around the problem, we take advantage of the fact that an instantaneous quantum quench of a weakly interacting condensate produces depletion with a similar time-integrated momentum profile \(\int dt n_B(k, t) \propto 1/k^4\) to the ground state value, but with a somewhat higher depletion, as described in detail in \[74, 80\]. Simulations show that non-instantaneous but rapid quenches produce lower amounts of quantum depletion, as shown in Fig. 6 (left panel). To generate these ensembles, we used the following ramp:

\[
g_B(t) = \begin{cases} 
\left( \frac{t-t_{\text{start}}}{t_{\text{ramp}}} \right) g & \text{when } t < t_{\text{start}} + t_{\text{ramp}} \\
g & \text{when } t \geq t_{\text{start}} + t_{\text{ramp}}
\end{cases}
\]  

(31)
starting at negative $t_{\text{start}}$, and evolving till $t = 0$. Thus $t_{\text{ramp}}$ was the ramp time, and the remaining time: $|t_{\text{start}}| - t_{\text{ramp}}$, an equilibration time. We carried out a calibration like that shown in Fig. 5 (Upper panel) for each set of cloud and trap parameters needed. Then for the initial in situ ensemble in the trap we chose the ensemble generated with the $t_{\text{ramp}}$ that produces total quantum depletion in agreement with the in situ value (Eqn 10) for the condensate ground state (like the blue data point in Fig. 6, Upper panel). The value of $t_{\text{start}}$ was $-101\mu$s for the weakly trapped cases ($\omega = 45 \times 425 \times 425 \text{ Hz and } \bar{\omega} = 201 \text{ Hz}$) and $-198\mu$s for the strongly trapped cases ($\omega = 71 \times 902 \times 895 \text{ Hz and } \bar{\omega} = 393 \text{ Hz}$) detailed in Table. III. Fig. 6 (Lower panel) shows an example of the evolution of the contact in situ during this initial state generation. Properties of the initial states are labelled (CT) and (ST) in Fig. 5 (a).

**C. Simulation types**

Detailed data extracted from the simulations are given in Table. III. Several types of simulations were made, with shorthand labels as per Fig. 5 (CE) Release of atoms from the trap, as in the experiment. Here the potential was reduced exponentially

$$V(x) = \frac{m}{2} \left( \omega_x^2 x^2 + \omega_y^2 y^2 + \omega_z^2 z^2 \right) e^{-t/\tau_{\text{release}}},$$

(32)

with time constant $\tau_{\text{release}} = 37.5\mu$s. The initial trap frequencies were $\omega = 425 \times 425 \times 45 \text{ Hz and } \omega = 902 \times 895 \times 71 \text{ Hz}$, and two variants of the initial state were simulated: a low density and a high density cloud.

**CS** A theory work devoted to an analysis of the fate of quantum depletion after release from a trap [24] predicted that no depletion survives – in stark contrast to what we and [7] see experimentally, and to the CE simulations. To test the hypothesis that the difference is due to our system breaking the adiabaticity assumed in [23], we ran simulations in which the trap is not rapidly released, but ramped down in strength over a much longer time period. The timescales here can be compared to the characteristic healing timescale $t_{\xi} = \hbar/gm_0$ in the centre of the trapped cloud [86]. Here it is $t_{\xi} = 15 - 40\mu$s, which is closely comparable to the trap release time $\tau_{\text{release}}$, so a suspicion that adiabaticity is strongly broken in the CE simulations is warranted. The CS simulations, on the other hand, ramped the trap as follows:

$$V(x) = \frac{m}{2} \left( \omega_x^2 x^2 + \omega_y^2 y^2 \left( 1 - \frac{t}{2t_{\text{ramp}}} \right)^2 + \omega_z^2 z^2 \right),$$

(33)

with timescales of order 1-2ms (see Table. III). The simulations were run up till $t = t_{\text{ramp}}$ when the trap frequency was half the original one. The in situ expression (Eqn 10) predicts that the depletion should reduce $\propto \bar{\omega}/t$ to about half its original value. Indeed, such a reduction of depletion was observed, strongly supporting the hypothesis that adiabaticity is needed for agreement with the results of [24].

**SE** The healing time $t_{\xi}$ is the typical timescale on which depleted atoms can be produced or reabsorbed into the condensate. To avoid the latter and survive trap release, a depleted atom should travel further than the extent of the cloud on this timescale. The velocity distribution of the depletion atoms is isotropic in situ, being given by $mv^2/2 \approx gm_0$. Therefore, $v \approx \sqrt{2gm_0/m} = \bar{\tau}$, which in an isotropic system gives a chance of escape for only the highest $k$ part of the Bogoliubov spectrum with

![Fig. 6. Details of initial state preparation, shown on the $N = 455852$ case. Upper panel: Calibration data. Shown is the calculated contact $C_{\text{sim}}$ at the end of the initial state generation ($t = 0$), as a function of the quench ramp time $t_{\text{ramp}}$. The horizontal dashed line shows the LDA prediction $C = 0.102 \text{ pm}^{-1}$, the blue data point the ensemble that was deemed to agree, and was used for subsequent simulations for $t > 0$. Lower panel: Evolution and stabilisation of the contact. The blue shaded area shows the duration of the ramp from $t_{\text{start}}$ to $t_{\text{start}} + t_{\text{ramp}}$. Orange shading denotes the error bars. $S = 4000$ trajectories in all cases.](image-url)
velocities \( \geq \pi \). However, the distance to travel to escape reabsorption depends on the cloud shape. In particular, escape is made easier in the tight trap directions (less distance to travel), and harder in the long trap direction. As a check that we have correctly identified the processes involved in depletion survival, we compared release of atoms from the experimental elongated clouds with spherically trapped clouds having the same central density \( n_0 \) and particle number \( N \). These clouds had isotropic trapping frequency \( \omega = (\omega_x^2 + \omega_y^2)^{1/2} \) and are labelled (SE). Trap release followed \( \phi(t) \) as before. Indeed, as expected we find that the survival of depleted atoms is enhanced in the anisotropic trap compared to the spherical one.

D. Determination of the contact and tail strengths

Much as in the experiment, the k-space density \( n(k) \) in the simulations is very noisy in the asymptotic region of large \( |k| \), and a lot of averaging is needed to extract the contact. In light of the discussion on power laws, the exponent \( \alpha \) was not fitted here, but we did calculate both the fit coefficients \( C_{\text{sim}} \) on the function \( n_B(k) = C_{\text{sim}}/k^4 \) with \( \alpha = 4 \) assumed and the count of particles in the tails, \( N_{\text{kmimm}, \text{kmmax}} \) as in Table II, in order to have a systematic view of how correlated the two kinds of results are.

We proceed as follows: The simulations provide a density of depleted particles \( n_B(k) \). Like with the experimental counts, we keep only density that is far enough away \( (\phi_{\text{cc}}, \text{usually } 60^\circ) \) from the long axis of the cloud. The simulated system is axially symmetric around the long axis. We do not restrict counting to the vicinity of the vertical axis because here there are no detector irregularities to avoid, and this allows us to improve the signal to noise ratio. The particle counts \( N_B(k) = n_B(k) V/V \) are finely binned according to the absolute value of the momentum \( k = |k| \), giving total bin count \( N_k \). The field is simulated on a square lattice in \( k \) space, in which each site corresponds to a k-space volume of \( \Delta V_k = (2\pi)^3 V/V \) with real space volume \( V \). Therefore the total bin volume \( V_k \) is obtained by binning the site volumes, and the mean density in each bin is \( N_k/V_k \) so \( n_k = (2\pi)^3 N_k/V_k \). Each bin gives an estimate of the corresponding apparent contact:

\[
e(k) = n_k k^4 = N_k k^4/(2\pi)^3.
\]

The statistical error estimate on \( c(k) \), \( \Delta c(k) \), is obtained by averaging subensembles, then using the central limit theorem (CLT) on the subensemble averages. Fig. 7 shows example values and error estimates, while also demonstrating the difficulties involved.

We can see that for a significant range of \( k \) values the \( c(k) \) estimate gives fluctuations around a constant value. However, several difficulties in extracting the overall trend are also evident. Low \( k \) values are not representative because the particles in the shaded region never emerge from the condensate and are not measured in the experiment. Therefore we remove data below a value \( k_{\text{inner}} \) from consideration. \( k_{\text{inner}} \) is chosen such that it does not include any depletion that would significantly overlap with the BEC in the final expanded cloud and be obscured by it. This corresponds also to the energy at which the quasiparticle spectrum becomes particle-like, since the mean field energy in the centre of the trapped cloud is responsible for both effects.

High \( k \) values, on the other hand, suffer from statistical error sufficiently high as to make them useless, and so we also choose a maximum \( k_{\text{outer}} \) value, and only use \( k \in [k_{\text{inner}}, k_{\text{outer}}] \) to extract the contact estimate. The useless high \( k \) region changes with time during the simulation. To systematically adapt our fitting region to this, we choose \( k_{\text{outer}} \) according to the calculated statistical error such that

\[
\Delta c(k, t) \leq \Delta_{\text{max}} \quad \forall k \leq k_{\text{outer}}(t),
\]

and \( \Delta_{\text{max}} \) is chosen once for all times in a simulation. This gives a time-dependent fitting region \( k \in [k_{\text{inner}}, k_{\text{outer}}(t)] \). The final contact estimate \( C_{\text{sim}}(t) \) is the mean of all \( c(k, t) \) values in the fitting range. Error bars on \( C_{\text{sim}}(t), \Delta C_{\text{sim}}(t) \), are obtained from a CLT estimate of the error in the mean of the points used, after binning enough neighbouring points to encompass the autocorrelation (i.e. so that neighbouring bins are
uncorrelated). The $\Delta_{\text{max}}$ is chosen low enough so that the statistical error in individual points $\Delta c(k, t)$ at the large $k$ end does not put off the overall contact estimation $C_{\text{sim}}(t) \pm \Delta C_{\text{sim}}(t)$. Operationally we choose the value of $\Delta_{\text{max}}$ at which the error introduced by adding successive high $k$ points introduces more uncertainty than the reduction thanks to a larger ensemble.

**IV. DISCUSSION**

In sum, we find that the number of atoms in the large-$k$ tails is predicted by the product $N_0n_0 \propto (N^7/\omega^6)^{1/5}$, in line with Tan’s theory of the contact (Eqns. [12][14]). However, the sensitivity of this relationship is significantly different than expected by a factor of order 8(3), which is not accounted for by any known systematic effects. As we discussed in Section II A 1, there are fundamental challenges in the analysis of heavy-tailed distributions which preclude any decisive evidence regarding the functional form of the momentum tails. We surmise that the tails are indeed a signature of quantum depletion (per the first point), albeit subject to some physical effect during the expansion as discussed below, or some nonequilibrium enhancement in the trapped state. We do note that the prior work [7] reported results which fall within the uncertainty range of our analysis. Indeed, Fig. 4 in [7] could be said to display the relevant scaling with respect to $N_0n_0$, but the reported values of the apparent contact should be considered alongside the caveats discussed in Section II A 1.

Taken together with the simulations, our findings show that the survival of the quantum depletion into the far-field is plausible, but not as a straightforward mapping into the far-field density. In a non-interacting ballistic expansion, the far-field density distribution would be a direct realization of the in-trap momentum distribution of the cloud. However, this correspondence is known not to be completely faithful because the dispersal of the mean-field energy into kinetic energy, known as the release energy, imparts some acceleration to the atoms during the early stages of the expansion. This effect is responsible for the famous inversion of the cloud aspect ratio upon release from harmonic traps.

One potential interpretation of these results is that the depleted atoms are accelerated by the non-uniform mean-field energy of the condensate during the expansion. In detail, after a quench into the free particle regime, the condensate expands hydrodynamically on timescales of $1/\omega$. This is an adiabatic process for the low momentum depletion, whereby some depleted atoms are absorbed back into the condensate in agreement with [23]. However, the characteristic time for reabsorption is $\hbar/g_0$, slow enough that quasiparticles in the particle branch of the Bogoliubov dispersion have sufficient velocity to escape the expanding cloud without being reabsorbed and thus transition to free atoms. Quasiparticles whose wavenumber exceeds that of the speed of sound lie within the particle-like branch of the Bogoliubov spectrum, which for our considerations is on the order of $k \gtrsim 2 \mu m^{-1}$, well within the thermal velocities. Therefore most atoms with $k \gtrsim 6 \mu m^{-1}$ would avoid absorption. This effect leads to the persistence of populated high-$k$ modes in the far-field, which were detected in the experiment.

Moreover, an atom inside the BEC experiences an effective force from the gradient of the mean-field potential $F = -4\pi \hbar^2 m^{-1} a \nabla n(x)$. This ends escaping depleted particles with a greater momentum, increasing the amplitude of the tails in the far-field. Further, it is much easier for depletion atoms to escape and be accelerated along the tightly-confined axes of a cigar-shaped cloud because the distances $R_{\text{TF}} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2g_0/m}$ are reduced by $\omega/\omega_{y,z}$, whereas the initial mean depletion velocities in situ $v \sim \sqrt{2g_0/m}$ are isotropic. Indeed, spherical clouds (SE) exhibit a much weaker effect than the elongated clouds (CE) owing to the longer escape time. This also presents as an increase in $C_{\text{sim}}$ and $A_{\text{sim}}$ for collection regions with a higher $\phi_c$. The statistical uncertainty in the experimental findings preclude a definitive comparison on this particular point.

The interpretation just described is supported by another observation within the simulations: During the expansion we observe a decrease in the total number of depleted particles (reabsorption) and a simultaneous increase of the large-$k$ population (forcing). This also corroborates the above interpretation of the experimental findings, and results in tail amplitudes which are consistent with the quantum depletion multiplied by a constant factor. However, a mystery remains: Why is there an excess of particles in the depletion region which is so much greater than accounted for by this picture? This issue should be resolved if far-field observations are to be interpreted in terms of the in-trap physics of interest.

As we discussed, our systematic uncertainties are unable to account for the observed excess population of the quantum-depleted tails. Further, despite the ultracold clouds being realized at finite temperatures, the thermal population of quasiparticles cannot account for the observed counts. The thermal quasiparticles in the Bogoliubov picture simply map onto the thermal population of constituent particles of the same momentum [87]. Therefore the phonon/particle changeover is not responsible for the inflections seen at high $k$ in Fig. 2(a). Hence, given the doubly-exponential decay of thermally populated states, the large-$k$ tails are unambiguously not thermal effects.

The utility and ubiquity of far-field imaging (including in MCP-DLD setups using helium) stems from the relative simplicity of implementation and interpretation. A systematic deviation from the expected in-situ amplitude of the high-$k$ tails could mean that such techniques are not the appropriate tool to study the details of the quantum-depleted momentum distribution. It is plausible that meaningful inferences about the in-trap physics could follow from a better understanding of the mecha-
nism underlying the anomaly. Toward this, it would be informative to determine whether the outstanding discrepancy originates in the trapped condensate or is due to some unknown non-equilibrium effect during expansion. This question invites complementary studies of the in situ depletion in He\textsuperscript{*} BECs. Such an investigation requires an in situ probe of the contact, such as RF spectroscopy or Bragg spectroscopy. The latter may be the most fruitful of the two because of the difficulty of interpreting the results from the former, sketched below.

The basic principle of RF contact spectroscopy is to apply a monochromatic RF probe which is detuned from the resonance between two spin states, coupling atoms in the initial spin state to an untrapped channel. One then performs a differential measurement of the atom number and expects the signal strength to scale as $\omega_{\text{RF}}^{3/2}$ with the detuning from the RF resonance. The loss rate is also proportional to the difference of reciprocal scattering lengths $\Gamma \propto (1/a_{i,i} - 1/a_{i,f})$ between pairs of atoms in initial-initial ($a_{i,i}$) and initial-final ($a_{i,f}$) spin states [6, 24]. For He\textsuperscript{*} (spin 1) the scattering lengths $a_{1,1}$ and $a_{1,0}$ are identical [88], rendering the preferred $m_f = 1 - m_i = 0$ transition unusable. On the other hand, $a_{1,-1} = 3/7a_{1,1}$ [89], and the singlet transition can be driven without populating the $m_f = 0$ state. In principle this could produce a detectable flux of atoms to perform sensitive in-trap contact measurements, however, collisions in the $^{12}\Sigma_g^+$ channel have large Penning ionization rates which lead to significant trap losses [88]. The ionization products would be detectable by in-vacuum channel electron multipliers but require theoretical work to disentangle from the spectroscopic signal. Further, while other atomic species offer Feshbach resonances by which to tune the inter-species scattering length (and hence signal or ionization rate), He\textsuperscript{*} has no such feature. While such a measurement is not prima facie impossible, Bragg spectroscopy may yield more readily interpretable results.

In conclusion, our work expands the growing suite of far-field investigations of quantum depletion [7, 13]. The inherent challenges of analysing heavy-tailed distributions make definitive comparison of the decay exponent impossible, but we find statistically robust evidence that the quantum depletion can, remarkably, survive the expansion and dilution of its original condensate. Our simulations clarify how the depletion can be visible in the far-field momentum distribution here and in earlier experiments, and that the hydrodynamic approximation does not capture sufficient short-wavelength information to make detailed predictions about the high-momentum behaviour. We thus find a partial explanation for the deviation of the far-field distribution from both the inner ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\omega$ (Hz)</th>
<th>$C_{\text{sim}}(t)$</th>
<th>$C_{\text{sim}}(t)/C_{\text{sim}(0)}$</th>
<th>$N_B(t)$</th>
<th>$k_{\text{inner}} - k_{\text{outer}}$</th>
<th>$\Delta_{\text{max}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$ (ms)</td>
<td>$\mu m^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\mu m^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\mu m^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\mu m^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\mu m^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0260(13)</td>
<td>2.1 – 4.2</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.060(5)</td>
<td>2.2 – 4.75</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.034(4)</td>
<td>2.9 – 4.9</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.100(3)</td>
<td>3.25 – 5.4</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.025(3)</td>
<td>3.1 – 4.1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.060(9)</td>
<td>3.2 – 4.1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.011(6)</td>
<td>3.1 – 4.1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.090(7)</td>
<td>3.2 – 4.1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III.** Main simulation data and parameters for fitting of $k^{-4}$ tail amplitude $C_{\text{sim}}$. The time $t$ for which data are calculated is counted relative to the start of the trap release. Abbreviations (CT, CE, ...) as in Figure 3a of the main text. The range $k_{\text{inner}} - k_{\text{outer}}$ was chosen as explained in the text and used to obtain the estimate and uncertainty for $C_{\text{sim}}$. In all cases, $S = 4000$ trajectories averaged. $N_B$ is the number of Bogoliubov field particles as per [25].
situ and the hydrodynamic pictures. The major factors are the momentum-dependent reabsorption of Bogoliubov excitations and the dispersal of the interaction energy into kinetic energy. Together, these result in a growth of the $k^{-4}$ tails of the momentum distribution during freefall.
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[59] Applying a fit of the form $f_a(k) = n_f(k) k^4 + C$ to data scaled as $f(k) = k^a n(k)$ minimizes the error term $\sum (k_i^4 n(k_i) - k_i^4 n_f(k_i))$ which is equivalent to weighting the error terms for the original $n(k)$ data by $k^4$. Moreover, the fit is highly sensitive to the choice of weighting function. If one constrains the exponent in the fit of such an $f(k)$ at $a = 4$, then changing the power of the weighting function of the squared errors in the fit from $k^4$ by 0.1 to $k^{4.20}$ changes the fitted $C$ by a factor of ten.


[62] Note that the integral of $n(k)$ is most easily performed in spherical coordinates and requires the Jacobian $(2\pi)^{-d}d\mathbf{k}$ to ensure normalization.


[77] P. Deuar, Quantum 5, 455 (2021).


[87] See, for example, [43] Chap. 8.3. or [2].