

Measurement-based cooling of many-body quantum systems

Tarek A. Elsayed^{1,*}

¹*Department of Physics, School of Science and Engineering,
The American University in Cairo, AUC Avenue, P.O. Box 74, New Cairo, 11835, Egypt*
(Dated: July 26, 2022)

We introduce a new technique for cooling many-body quantum systems of unknown Hamiltonians to their ground states with a high fidelity. The technique works by switching on a strong field and applying a sequence of projective measurements and RF pulses to polarize the system along the direction of the external field before we adiabatically switch the field off. The evolution of the system towards its ground state is governed by the quantum adiabatic theorem. The proposed technique is particularly relevant to the field of NMR state preparation. We present numerical simulation results for the technique applied to quantum spin chains with long and short range interactions.

The problem of driving a quantum system very close to a desired state is of enormous practical importance. With the advent of quantum technologies that rely on quantum systems being in certain states (e.g., the ground state), the field of quantum control has witnessed a surge of interest in the past two decades [1–3]. In fact, the most prominent application of quantum control is the optimal control of solid state Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) which has been actively pursued for a long time [4–7]. The essence of optimal control or quantum state engineering [8–11] is to design the (time-dependent) Hamiltonian that coherently drives the quantum system from an initial state to a desired target state. With the recent progress in quantum measurement techniques [12], quantum control methods employed a feedback mechanism as in classical control theory [13].

Controlling the dynamics of a quantum system with a feedback mechanism typically involves monitoring a few parameters of the system and employs a feedback loop in order to stabilize the state of the system against the effects of the environment [14]. A major problem in quantum control is the back-action entailed by the measurement on the system. This problem could be mitigated by evading the effect of the back-action [15, 16]. Recently, however, other schemes have been proposed that actually harness the effect of the projective measurement on the system and make use of the back-action as a part of the algorithm itself [17–23]. The purpose of this work is to present a new technique in this regard. Namely, we adiabatically evolve a quantum system of interacting many particles towards its ground state after polarizing it by applying a sequence of projective measurements and radio frequency (RF) perturbations. Our technique is most relevant to NMR of small quantum system.

The technique proposed below is valid for an interacting many-body quantum system in an unknown state (typically a high temperature state) and aims to drive the system to its ground state or very close to it. An efficient method that is often used for that purpose is the adiabatic demagnetization [24] which requires an initially

fully polarized state. However, bringing the system to this state is a challenge in itself, especially if the system is in contact with an environment. A system in thermal equilibrium in a strong magnetic field will have typically a very small polarization, determined by the temperature and the magnetic field strength. The algorithm we propose here to polarize the system makes use of the fact that it is much easier to polarize small parts of the system one at a time while imparting a minimal disturbance to the rest of the system instead of polarizing the whole system in one shot. The reason is that the size of the subsets of the Hilbert space corresponding to one partition of the system being completely polarized is much larger than the size of the subset corresponding to the whole system being completely polarized and therefore it is easier to drive the system into states corresponding to polarized individual partitions, one at a time.

The proposed technique consists of two steps. In step I, an external strong field \mathbf{B} is applied which alters the energy spectra and eigenstates of the system, letting the ground state of the new Hamiltonian have a very large polarization antiparallel to \mathbf{B} . We then make a sequence of spin polarization measurements of randomly chosen individual particles along the direction of the external field. If the particle is aligned antiparallel to \mathbf{B} , we do nothing. Otherwise, if it is aligned parallel to \mathbf{B} , we perturb the system by an RF field perpendicular to \mathbf{B} for a certain time interval before we make another measurement of the same particle. We keep measuring the same particle repetitively at specific times separated by periods of unitary evolution under the effect of the RF perturbation till it has been projected onto the correct direction. If we repeat this procedure many times (much more than the total number of particles) before the system relaxes back to thermal equilibrium, the system will eventually be polarized along \mathbf{B} , and thus its entropy will be hugely reduced. Of course, while measuring a certain particle and perturbing the system, the state of a previously measured particle will be altered. Nevertheless, our numerical simulations show that by applying this scheme, the system will always find a path towards the fully polarized state for a small quantum system.

When the system is fully polarized, it will be very close

* tarek.ahmed.elsayed@gmail.com

to the ground state of the new Hamiltonian. In step II, we do an adiabatic depolarization, which is a well-known technique used for attaining very low temperatures [25–27], by switching off the external field very slowly. According to the quantum adiabatic theorem and under certain conditions about the system, the state of the slowly varying Hamiltonian will remain in the vicinity of the ground state of the instantaneous Hamiltonian. Eventually, when the field is completely off, the system will be found very close to its true ground state. Note that applying this scheme does not require knowing the exact Hamiltonian of the bare system.

Let us illustrate how this algorithm works with a detailed example. Consider an isolated quantum spin 1/2 chain consisting of N particles with periodic boundary conditions and local interactions (nearest neighbor interaction). The Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \sum_m S_m^x S_{m+1}^x + 0.5(S_m^y S_{m+1}^y - S_m^z S_{m+1}^z) + 0.3 \sum_m S_m^y,$$

where S_m^i is the spin operator for the m^{th} spin in the i^{th} direction. This system has a ground state energy $E_0 = -4.189$ J (we take $\hbar = 1$ and $\gamma = 1$ throughout this article, where γ is the gyromagnetic ratio). The last term in the Hamiltonian is added to break the degeneracy of the ground state. The chain is initially in an infinite temperature pure state, and we switch on an external magnetic field \mathbf{B} in the z direction of strength $B_0 = 10$ which adds a term $\mathcal{H}_z = B_0 \sum_m S_m^z$ to the Hamiltonian. A time step of $dt = 0.001$ s is used in the simulation while a fourth-order Runge-Kutta method is used to evolve the time-dependent Schrodinger's equation.

Let us assume that we make a measurement of a certain spin along the z direction and find it parallel to \mathbf{B} . In a typical NMR setting, the ideal method to perturb the system in order to flip the direction of a spin to a direction antiparallel to \mathbf{B} is to apply a π -pulse to that particular spin. However, selective excitation of individual particles may not be applicable to relatively large systems. As an alternative, we apply a weaker pulse to the whole system which does not perturb it much. In doing so, the repetitive measurement of a certain spin several times while applying the weak RF perturbation between the measurements will increase the likelihood to flip that spin while at the same time not perturb the other particles substantially. Our simulation shows that this technique works so well for systems of interacting quantum spins.

We, therefore, employ a uniform RF field in the x direction which affects all spins equally. This field adds a term $h_x = h(t) \sum_m S_m^x$ to the Hamiltonian. The time varying function $h(t)$ is defined as $h(t) = h_0 g(t) \cos(\omega t)$ where $\omega = 5$ rad/s (i.e., half Larmor frequency defined as γB_0) and the strength of the perturbation $h_0 = 1$. The function $g(t)$ is an on-off switch equal to 1 or 0 depending on whether we switch on the RF field or not. We make a measurement of a random spin along the z direction every period T . If the spin is found to be point-

ing down, we select another randomly chosen spin in the next round. Otherwise, if we find the spin pointing up along \mathbf{B} , we switch on the RF perturbation and keep measuring it every T . We take T to be equivalent to 0.5 cycles of the RF field. When a large number of successive measurements show that every spin we measure is found to be in the down state, we have a high confidence that the system is fully polarized (a projective measurement of all spins simultaneously can be done in this case if this is practically feasible).

The advantage of measuring only one single spin at a time is that measuring one single degree of freedom should entail a minimal disturbance to the system resulting from the interaction of the measured particle with its neighbors. While, here, we measure a single-particle degree of freedom, measuring a collective degree of freedom such as the total magnetization can be employed in other schemes of the feedback control of many-body quantum systems [28]. It is expected that the average time for the downfall to the fully polarized state increases as the size of the Hilbert space increases, however, it is not clear yet how the average time scales precisely with the number of spins. Since the proposed scheme requires measuring one particle at a time, the time taken to polarize the majority of spins will at best scale linearly with the size of the system. Another advantage is that the scheme is model-free, i.e., it does not require making guesses about the system or an initial learning phase that scales exponentially [29, 30].

Note that for this algorithm to work correctly, the average time needed to flip a spin that was measured to be in the wrong direction should be small enough such that the perturbation produced by the RF pulses will not increase the probability to flip another spin that was already measured in the desired direction beyond 50% when it is remeasured. This puts a further constraint on the maximum system size that can be cooled using this method since the larger the system, the more perturbations a correctly polarized spin will encounter before it is remeasured. Note also that for a system in contact with a thermal reservoir, the time taken to fully polarize the system should be less than the relaxation time to equilibrium from the completely polarized state, which may be of the order of T_1 relaxation time constant.

In Fig. 1, we show the total polarization of the system $M_z \equiv \langle \hat{M}_z \rangle$ where, $\hat{M}_z = \sum_m S_m^z$ during the downfall to the fully polarized state for a system consisting of $N = 14$ spins. In general, $M_z(t)$ will keep fluctuating randomly due to the back action entailed by the measurement and continuous perturbation of the RF field before it eventually embarks on a “free-fall” trajectory to the desired fully polarized state under the successive acts of projective measurement. While the time taken for this event to take place is unpredictable, the spontaneous downfall to the desired state seems to be an unavoidable fate of the state of a small quantum system. The essence of the proposed algorithm is to create a completely stable state (the desired state) and a completely unstable state (the




FIG. 1. (a) An illustration of the quantum control circuit proposed in the paper. The measurement outcomes from an apparatus measuring individual quantum particles are used to control the perturbation of the quantum system by RF pulses. (b) The evolution of the total magnetization of a system consisting of 14 spin-1/2 while applying the measurement-based polarization algorithm, starting from an unpolarized state.

state fully polarized in the opposite direction). The more the system approaches the undesired state, the more RF pulses will be applied to it that drives the system away from that state. Our simulations show that sooner or later, and no matter how large the size of the Hilbert space is, the system will be “attracted” to an unstable path that drives it steadily towards the desired state. The stronger the external field with respect to the typical interaction constants of the bare Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 , the more stable the desired state will be since \hat{M}_z commutes with \mathcal{H}_z but not with \mathcal{H}_0 .

As mentioned earlier, the fully polarized state in the presence of a strong external field is very close to the ground state of the full Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_z$. In our case, the ground state energy for $\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_z$ is -68.39 J while the energy of the fully polarized state is -68.25 J. In step II of the technique, we switch off the field very slowly by reducing its strength gradually as $B(t) = B_0 \cdot \exp(-t/T_0)$ with $T_0 = 10^4$ s. In Fig. 2, we show the evolution of the energy of the bare system as B is gradually switched off and the fidelity of the instantaneous state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ with respect to the exact ground state $|\psi_0\rangle$ defined as $|\langle\psi_0|\psi(t)\rangle|^2$. The achieved energy at the end of the adiabatic evolution approaches -4.152 J, which differs from the exact ground state energy by less than 1% while the fidelity approaches 93%. In general, the time required by the adiabatic evo-

lution phase depends on the energy gap of the system. It has been shown that this time grows polynomially with the size of the system when the system exhibits certain symmetries [31].

There are a few control parameters that can be adjusted in this algorithm for achieving the best performance. The strength of the external field is taken to be one order of magnitude stronger than the typical interaction strength of the bare Hamiltonian. Taking it much stronger will produce better fidelity, but, on the other hand, will prolong the adiabatic evolution time as well. The strength of the RF pulses is taken to be of the same order of magnitude as the interaction strength between the particles. A much stronger RF pulse will have the side effect of disturbing the spins which have already been polarized in the desired direction, while a much weaker pulse will not cause enough disturbance to the spin that has been measured to be aligned in the wrong direction.

In typical NMR experiments, the strength of the external field is much stronger than the typical local field at each particle resulting from its interaction with its neighbors. In this case, the proper RF frequency to be used to perturb the system is the Larmor frequency. In our numerical simulation, where the external field is only an order of magnitude stronger than the local field, we take the RF frequency to be a few multiples of the typical interaction constant of \mathcal{H}_0 . We also take the time interval between two successive measurements of the same spin to be half a cycle of the RF field. This choice will ensure that the spin rotates in one single direction around the x axis, thus maximizing the probability to have it flipped during the next measurement event. The probability to flip the spin in the z direction will increase when enough polarization in the xy plane of that particular spin builds up. Letting the rate of projective measurements become too fast compared to the timescales of the intrinsic dynamics will not leave room for spin polarization in the xy plane to develop and, at the same time, will also let the quantum Zeno effect set in, thus freezing out the spin dynamical evolution.

The proposed algorithm may be difficult to implement when there is a practical constraint that makes it hard to selectively measure each spin; for example, in an optical lattice where single-site measurement is performed by an off-resonant laser beam [32] that cannot be steered along the lattice with sufficient resolution. Nevertheless, we can still use a variant of the proposed scheme while measuring one single particle that will serve as a probe for the whole system. The idea is to polarize that particular spin in the desired direction by the act of measurement and then let it unitarily interact with the rest of the system for a short time interval. During the unitary interaction, it will transfer part of its polarization to the rest of the system, before we polarize it again by a new projective measurement and repeat this procedure many times. Upon measurement, given that the time interval of unitary evolution is short enough, the probe spin will be




FIG. 2. (a) Evolution of the instantaneous energy of the bare system $\langle \mathcal{H}_0 \rangle$ during the adiabatic evolution while slowly switching off the magnetic field. (b) The overlap between the instantaneous state and the ground state of the bare system $|\langle \psi_0 | \psi(t) \rangle|^2$. Insets (c) and (d) show the value of $B(t)$ as it changes from 10 to 0 and the change of the total magnetization of the system with time as the field is slowly switched off respectively. The initial spikes in (a) and (d) correspond to the initial phase of polarizing the system along the external magnetic field.

projected to the desired direction with a very high probability. If it is projected in the undesired direction, parallel to \mathbf{B} , we keep perturbing the system with RF pulses interspersed by projective measurements of that spin, as we did in the first scheme, till we project it along the desired direction. In order for this scheme to work, the time interval between successive measurements should be shorter than the timescale of the intrinsic dynamics of the system governed by \mathcal{H}_0 . Otherwise, it will have equal probabilities of being projected in either direction upon each measurement. On the other hand, as in the previous scheme, it shouldn't be much shorter than the intrinsic dynamics timescale in order to avoid the quantum Zeno effect. After a very large number of projective measurements, the system will be largely polarized opposite to \mathbf{B} and the magnetic field will be switched off slowly as in the first scheme.

Because we take a single spin to be representative of the rest of the system, it is expected that this scheme will work best when the system exhibits translation-invariance. Note that the role of the strong field in this algorithm is to make the total polarization a quasi-conserved quantity and thus help in the transfer of the polarization from the probe spin to the rest of the system




FIG. 3. (a,b) The evolution of the total magnetization for quantum spin chains consisting of 14 spin-1/2 particles with short-range and long-range interactions respectively while applying the scheme of repetitively measuring one single probe spin to polarize the system along an external magnetic field \mathbf{B} . (c,d) The evolution of the instantaneous energy of the bare Hamiltonian, $\langle \mathcal{H}_0 \rangle$, for both systems during the adiabatic evolution of the system while slowly switching off \mathbf{B} . The adiabatic evolution starts at $t = 10^4$ s.

through the inter-particle interaction during the unitary evolution periods between the repetitive acts of measurements. In actual NMR experiments of systems of interacting magnetic dipoles, a very strong field is used, and by working in the rotating reference frame defined by the Larmor frequency, the dipole-dipole interaction Hamiltonian reduces to the so-called truncated Hamiltonian which conserves the total magnetization along the magnetic field exactly [33].

Let us demonstrate the efficiency of this scheme by applying it to the same system above with short-range interactions and another system with long range interaction described by $\mathcal{H}_0 = \sum_{m < n} J_{mn} (S_m^x S_n^x + 0.5(S_m^y S_n^y - S_m^z S_n^z)) + 0.3 \sum_m S_m^y$, where the interaction strength J_{mn} falls off inversely with the distance between spin m and spin n as $\frac{1}{|m-n|}$. The ground state energy of the later system is $E_0 = -6.59$ J. We show in Figs. 3-a and 3-b the evolution of the total polarization M_z of both systems under the sequence of measurements of one single spin and the occasional RF excitation pulses. The spikes in M_z occur when the probe spin is occasionally projected in the undesired direction while the smooth parts in the plots correspond to the time intervals of pure repetitive measurements without applying the RF excitation pulses. During these intervals, the sequence of measurements and unitary evolution keeps increasing the total polarization of the system. The drawback of this scheme is the very long time taken to polarize the system compared with the first algorithm that measures all the spins.

We notice in Fig. 3 that, for the first Hamiltonian with

short range interaction, we could achieve a polarization strength of 85% of the maximum polarization while for the second Hamiltonian we achieve 70% of the maximum polarization. After slowly switching off the magnetic field starting at $t = 10^4$ s with a decay constant $T_0 = 8 \times 10^3$ s for both systems, we notice in Figs. 3-c and 3-d that they settle at energies -3.78 J and -4.81 J which differ from E_0 by 10% and 27% respectively. The fidelity of the final state with respect to the ground state in both cases is of the order of 10%.

To conclude, we have presented a cooling technique that can be used to bring a quantum system described by an unknown Hamiltonian in an arbitrary state close to its ground state using a combination of measurement-based polarization and adiabatic demagnetization. The basic principle is a divide-and-conquer strategy where we avoid the difficult task of polarizing the system directly, which requires exploring the full Hilbert space of the system, and replace it by the easy task of polarizing small parts of it, one at a time, which requires exploring a much smaller Hilbert space. The later task is easily achieved by the mere act of projective measurement. The first version of the technique measures every particle of the system till it is guaranteed that the majority of the particles are polarized antiparallel to a strong field. The second version measures one single probe particle successively, allowing it to transfer its polarization to the rest of the system between the successive measurements. In both cases, RF pulses are employed to perturb the system if the particle is measured along the undesired direction till it is projected onto the desired direction. Switching off the field slowly brings the system adiabatically to its ground state.

The fidelity of the final state depends on two factors.

(i) The closeness of the quantum state attained at the end of phase I to the ground state of the polarized Hamiltonian, which in turn depends on the strength of the mag-

netic field with respect to the typical interaction strength of the intrinsic Hamiltonian of the system. (ii) The accuracy of the adiabatic evolution phase. It is expected that the adiabatic evolution phase will suffer from several practical constraints [30]. Depending on the phase structure of the system, the timescale required for achieving a truly adiabatic driving may diverge and therefore, make it challenging to obtain a very high fidelity if the system exhibits a quantum phase transition or the energy levels exhibit avoided crossings for example [34, 35]. These concerns will limit the maximum fidelity that can be achieved in real situations or, alternatively, limit the type of systems for which this technique can be used.

In case simultaneous measurements of many particles are feasible, then one effective strategy that will speed up the polarization mechanism in step I is to employ a repetitive measurement of each spin once it has been polarized along the desired direction, as an add-on to the original algorithm, to confine that spin along that direction using quantum Zeno dynamics as in [19]. Another variation of step I will be to make the strength of the RF field dependent on how close we are from the desired state, i.e., to reduce the strength of the perturbation the higher the number of consecutive measurements obtained in the desired direction along the external field. The high polarization obtained in step I of the proposed technique can be combined with usual NMR techniques to achieve a much better resolution in NMR of small spin clusters as an alternative method to increasing the magnetic field strength. Although the treatment presented above focuses on interacting quantum spin systems, the technique is general and can be applied to other strongly correlated systems such as ultracold atoms in an optical lattice where adiabatic demagnetization has actually been shown to be an effective cooling technique. [24, 36, 37]. In this case, the earlier considerations about effects of the environment are not relevant since these systems are effectively isolated.

-
- [1] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 022108 (2000).
 - [2] A. Reiserer, C. Nölleke, S. Ritter, and G. Rempe, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 223003 (2013).
 - [3] L. Magrini, P. Rosenzweig, C. Bach, A. Deutschmann-Olek, S. G. Hofer, S. Hong, N. Kiesel, A. Kugi, and M. Aspelmeyer, *Nature* **595**, 373 (2021).
 - [4] L. M. K. Vandersypen and I. L. Chuang, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 1037 (2005).
 - [5] N. Khaneja, T. Reiss, C. Kehlet, T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, and S. J. Glaser, *Journal of magnetic resonance* **172**, 296 (2005).
 - [6] N. C. Nielsen, C. Kehlet, S. J. Glaser, and N. Khaneja, *eMagRes* (2007).
 - [7] M. H. Ram, V. Krithika, P. Batra, and T. Mahesh, *Physical Review A* **105**, 042437 (2022).
 - [8] S. G. Schirmer, in *Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Methods for Nonlinear Control 2006* (Springer, 2007) pp. 293–304.
 - [9] C. S. Chiu, G. Ji, A. Mazurenko, D. Greif, and M. Greiner, *Physical review letters* **120**, 243201 (2018).
 - [10] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. Ignacio Cirac, *Nature physics* **5**, 633 (2009).
 - [11] Y. Makhlin, G. Schön, and A. Shnirman, *Reviews of modern physics* **73**, 357 (2001).
 - [12] J. Zhang, Y.-x. Liu, R.-B. Wu, K. Jacobs, and F. Nori, *Physics Reports* **679**, 1 (2017).
 - [13] A. C. Doherty, S. Habib, K. Jacobs, H. Mabuchi, and S. M. Tan, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 012105 (2000).
 - [14] D. Dong and I. R. Petersen, *IET control theory & applications* **4**, 2651 (2010).
 - [15] M. Vanner, J. Hofer, G. Cole, and M. Aspelmeyer, *Nature communications* **4**, 1 (2013).
 - [16] M. Rossi, D. Mason, J. Chen, Y. Tsaturyan, and A. Schliesser, *Nature* **563**, 53 (2018).
 - [17] D. B. R. Dasari, S. Yang, A. Finkler, G. Kurizki, and J. Wrachtrup, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.09826* (2021).
 - [18] R. Puebla, O. Abah, and M. Paternostro, *Physical Re-*

- view B **101**, 245410 (2020).
- [19] J. Sørensen, M. Dalgaard, A. H. Kiilerich, K. Mølmer, and J. Sherson, [Physical Review A](#) **98**, 062317 (2018).
 - [20] G. Mazzucchi, W. Kozłowski, S. F. Caballero-Benitez, T. J. Elliott, and I. B. Mekhov, [Physical Review A](#) **93**, 023632 (2016).
 - [21] M. K. Pedersen, J. J. W. Sørensen, M. C. Tichy, and J. F. Sherson, [New Journal of Physics](#) **16**, 113038 (2014).
 - [22] S. Ashhab and F. Nori, [Phys. Rev. A](#) **82**, 062103 (2010).
 - [23] L. Buffoni, A. Solfanelli, P. Verrucchi, A. Cuccoli, and M. Campisi, [Physical review letters](#) **122**, 070603 (2019).
 - [24] A. E. Mirasola, M. L. Wall, and K. R. Hazzard, [Physical Review A](#) **98**, 033607 (2018).
 - [25] W. Giauque and D. MacDougall, [Physical Review](#) **43**, 768 (1933).
 - [26] W. De Haas, E. Wiersma, and H. Kramers, [Nature](#) **131**, 719 (1933).
 - [27] I. Shepherd and G. Feher, [Physical Review Letters](#) **15**, 194 (1965).
 - [28] T. A. Elsayed and B. V. Fine, [Phys. Rev. B](#) **105**, 104305 (2022).
 - [29] C. Negrevergne, T. Mahesh, C. Ryan, M. Ditty, F. Cyr-Racine, W. Power, N. Boulant, T. Havel, D. Cory, and R. Laflamme, [Physical review letters](#) **96**, 170501 (2006).
 - [30] M. Bukov, A. G. Day, D. Sels, P. Weinberg, A. Polkovnikov, and P. Mehta, [Physical Review X](#) **8**, 031086 (2018).
 - [31] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, and M. Sipser, arXiv preprint quant-ph/0001106 (2000).
 - [32] C. Gross and I. Bloch, [Annual Review of Cold Atoms and Molecules](#) , 181 (2015).
 - [33] A. Abragam, *The principles of nuclear magnetism* (Oxford university press, 1961).
 - [34] J. H. M. Jensen, F. S. Møller, J. J. Sørensen, and J. F. Sherson, [Physical Review A](#) **104**, 052210 (2021).
 - [35] P. Doria, T. Calarco, and S. Montangero, [Physical review letters](#) **106**, 190501 (2011).
 - [36] P. Medley, D. M. Weld, H. Miyake, D. E. Pritchard, and W. Ketterle, [Physical review letters](#) **106**, 195301 (2011).
 - [37] J. Schachenmayer, D. M. Weld, H. Miyake, G. A. Siviloglou, W. Ketterle, and A. J. Daley, [Physical Review A](#) **92**, 041602 (2015).