

# Thermometry of one-dimensional Bose gases with neural networks

Frederik Møller<sup>1</sup>, Thomas Schweigler<sup>1</sup>, Mohammadamin Tajik<sup>1</sup>, João Sabino<sup>1</sup>, Federica Cataldini<sup>1</sup>, Si-Cong Ji<sup>1</sup>, and Jörg Schmiedmayer<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), Atominstytut, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria*

(Dated: May 10, 2021)

Thermometry of one-dimensional Bose gases can be achieved in various ways, which all revolve around comparing measurement statistics to theoretical prediction. As a result, many repetitions of the measurement are required before an accurate comparison can be made. In this work, we train a neural network to estimate the temperature of a one-dimensional Bose gas in the quasi-condensate regime from a single absorption image. We benchmark our model on both simulated and experimentally measured data. Comparing with our standard method of density ripple thermometry based on fitting two-point correlation function shows that the network can achieve the same precision needing only half the amount of images. Our findings highlight the gain in efficiency when incorporating neural networks into analysis of data from cold gas experiments. Further, the neural network architecture presented can easily be reconfigured to extract other parameters from the images.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Machine learning based on neural networks has in many ways revolutionized our ways of processing data [1]. Recently, the techniques have also started gaining traction in the quantum physics research, where they have been successfully employed for a number of applications [2–10]. Although still in its infancy, the increasing availability of computational power and user friendly machine learning libraries makes it easier than ever before for research groups to explore how they can benefit from these new techniques. Therefore, establishing and exploring the potential of neural networks in quantum research is highly important.

Particularly within the field of ultracold quantum gases [11] could machine learning have a tremendous impact. These quantum many-body systems exhibit complex dynamics and contain a vast amount of information, making theoretical descriptions very challenging. Hence, descriptions often rely on effective or emergent models [12–19], aiming to reduce the complexity. Neural networks, on the other hand, have demonstrated the ability themselves to find the most efficient representations of complex states [4, 5, 20].

Also in an experimental setting can neural networks be employed to great effect [21, 22], particularly in enhancing the readout and analysis of data [6, 23]. The measurement of quantum gases is primarily done using the techniques of absorption or fluorescence imaging, which produce images of the atomic density integrated along the imaging direction. From these images a few physical quantities can be extracted directly, whereas others require fitting with effective theories. One of neural networks greatest strengths is image processing and pattern recognition, which can be leveraged to directly extract information from the images [24] without having to fit the data with appropriate models. Hence, neural networks can potentially yield an efficiency gain, as more information can be extracted per image using neural networks compared to fitting. Further, the networks can be trained to distinguish experimental noise from signal [25],

reducing the number of pictures needed to achieve high signal-to-noise ratio. Reducing the number of images required for a given measurement is highly important, as each cold gas realization is timely to prepare and is often destroyed upon imaging.

In this work, we train a neural network model to estimate the temperature of a one-dimensional (1d) quasi-condensate directly from a single absorption image. For such quasi-condensates, fluctuations of the density have been a key observable for the readout of many different quantities, including the temperature [26–32]. The fluctuations are individually random but statistically distributed according to some underlying temperature-dependent spectrum, which can be derived theoretically. However, distortions of the fluctuations from the imaging process makes associating a given sample of fluctuations to some temperature very difficult. By simulating the full imaging process, we can create a large number of artificial absorption images of condensates with a known temperature [33]. Employing these images as training data for a neural network, the trained model effectively becomes a non-linear map between the samples of fluctuations and the underlying distribution. The paper is thus structured as follows: In section II, we review the relevant theoretical aspects of fluctuations in in one-dimensional quasi-condensates and the standard density ripples thermometry. Next, in section III, we discuss the experimental setup and the architecture of the neural network. In section IV, the trained neural networks are first benchmarked on simulated images and then employed on experimentally measured images. Finally, in section V, we conclude and give an outlook for future improvements and applications of the neural network model.

## II. THEORY

Fluctuations play a very important role in the physics of one-dimensional many-body systems of interacting bosons. Measurements of these fluctuations, be it phase or density fluctuations, and their correlations yield im-




FIG. 1. Illustration of the application of a neural network for thermometry. The condensate is initially trapped on the atom chip trap. In order to probe it, the gas is released and undergoes free expansion, whereafter it is exposed to the imaging light. After passing through the cloud, the imaging light is captured by a camera, producing an absorption image of the cloud. By integrating out the transverse direction (here vertical) the 1d density profile is obtained and fed directly as input to the neural network. The network consists of two stages: First, the profiles pass through a series of 1d convolutional layers, where a kernel scans over the profiles extracting important features. Next, the extracted features are passed to several dense layers, which process said features. Finally, the network outputs a normal distribution for the temperature probability, parameterized by the two output values  $\mu_T$  and  $\sigma_T$ .

portant information about properties of the system [26–29]. For instance, a well-established method of thermometry is via the observations of density ripple patterns [34, 35]. These patterns emerge in the atomic density profile as the gas expands freely and are caused by initial, temperature dependent, fluctuations in the phase. The temperature can be inferred from density correlations, however, the measurement must be repeated many times before the correlation function can be accurately constructed. Additionally, the imaging process itself distorts the measured ripple patterns, making comparisons to theory challenging [35]. Neural networks, on the other hand, do not require any knowledge of the complicated underlying theory. Instead, they can be trained to simply correlate a set of features in a image to some corresponding variable, in this case a temperature. This “black box” behavior makes neural networks such a powerful tool for studying fluctuations in complex many-body systems. However, careful training of the network is necessary for achieving high-accuracy predictions. In order to have exact knowledge of the temperature of a given training example, we generate simulated images as our training data.

### A. Fluctuations in one-dimensional condensates

The one-dimensional (1d) Bose gas with contact interactions is described by the Lieb-Liniger model with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int dz \hat{\psi}^\dagger(z) \partial_z^2 \hat{\psi}(z) + \frac{g_{1d}}{2} \int dz \hat{\psi}^\dagger(z) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(z) \hat{\psi}(z) \hat{\psi}(z), \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{\psi}$  are the bosonic fields,  $m$  is the mass of the atoms, and  $g_{1d}$  is the interaction strength [36]. Unlike their three-dimensional counterpart, one-dimensional Bose gases can not achieve long range phase order. Nevertheless, local phase coherence can be achieved in the quasi-condensate regime. In this regime the properties of the fluctuations can be described by a spectrum of Bogoliubov-type modes. The fluctuations can be expressed through the phase-density representation of the field operator [12]

$$\hat{\psi}(z) = e^{i\hat{\theta}(z)} \sqrt{n_{1d}(z) + \delta\hat{n}(z)}. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\hat{\theta}$  is the operator describing the fluctuating phase, while  $\delta\hat{n}$  are the density fluctuations relative to the mean density profile  $n_{1d}$ . Assuming a homogeneous system contained in a hard-walled box of length  $L$ , the fluctuations can be expanded into modes with wavenumbers  $k_n = n\pi/L$  following [37]

$$\delta\hat{n}(z) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}} \sum_n \delta\hat{n}_n \cos(k_n z) \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{\theta}(z) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}} \sum_n \hat{\theta}_n \cos(k_n z) \quad (4)$$

At sufficiently large temperatures the average occupation of the observable low lying modes is much larger than one, whereby the fluctuations can be treated as classical fields  $\theta(z)$  and  $\delta n(z)$ . Finally, in the classical field and Bogoliubov approximation, the thermal expectation

values are

$$\langle \theta_n \rangle = \langle \delta n_n \rangle = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\langle \theta_n \theta_m \rangle = \delta_{n,m} \frac{k_B T}{2} \frac{2m}{\hbar^2 k_n^2 n_{1d}} \quad (6)$$

$$\langle \delta n_n \delta n_m \rangle = \delta_{n,m} \frac{k_B T}{2} \left( \frac{g_{1d}}{2} + \frac{\hbar^2 k_n^2}{8m n_{1d}} \right)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

As evident of eqs. (6) and (7), the variance of both the phase and density fluctuations scales linearly with the temperature  $T$ . Hence, in principle, both types of fluctuation can therefore be used for thermometry.

For thermal excitations the phase fluctuations are Gaussian, whereby the phase profile  $\theta(z)$  can be described by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck stochastic process with  $z$  playing the role of time [38]

$$\frac{d}{dz} \theta(z) = f(z) . \quad (8)$$

Here,  $f(z)$  is a random force, sampled from a Gaussian distribution with zero mean, and variance  $mk_B T / \hbar^2 n_{1d}$ , thus reproducing the thermal expectation values of the phase. Similarly, the thermal expectation values of the density correlations can be used as basis for Gaussian sampling of the density fluctuations.

### B. Formation of ripple patterns during free expansion

In density ripples thermometry the phase fluctuations are probed through measurement of the fluctuating density pattern emerging under free expansion of the gas. The tight transverse confinement necessary for achieving a 1d gas induces a rapid transverse expansion of the gas when released, thus preventing any interactions. Upon the free expansion, the phase gradient gives rise to a density current following

$$j(z) = \frac{\hbar}{m} \partial_z \theta(z) (n_{1d} + \delta n(z)) . \quad (9)$$

The fluctuations of the phase field cause different regions of the gas to expand at different velocities, giving rise to the formation of density ripple patterns over time. For longer expansion times, the contrast of the density ripples increases. As discussed in Ref. [34], the density ripples are distributed according to a certain power spectrum. The power spectrum is temperature dependent and can be measured experimentally, by taking the Fourier transform of the two-point density correlation function

$$g_2(\delta z) = \frac{\int dz \langle n(z + \delta z) n(z) \rangle}{\int dz \langle n(z + \delta z) \rangle \langle n(z) \rangle} . \quad (10)$$

Here, the expectation value is measured experimentally by repeating the measurement several times and taking the average thereof. Following Ref. [34],  $g_2$ -functions for

various temperatures can be computed and fitted to the measured results, whereby an estimate of the temperature can be made. This process constitutes the method of density ripples thermometry. However, the points made above also highlight some of the weaknesses of the approach, which could be overcome using neural networks. Firstly, in order to obtain the  $g_2$ -function above, many measurements must be taken, making the method rather inefficient. Secondly, the experimental imaging process itself distorts the correlation function, making a direct comparison to the theory curve difficult.

The current solution is based on empirical studies and requires convolving simulated density profiles with an effective Gaussian point spread function before computing the theoretical  $g_2$ -function, in order to mimic the limited resolution of the imaging system. In reality, the resolution of the imaging system depends on a number of parameters, including properties of the condensate itself. Therefore, the exact width of the effective point spread function is unknown, and is therefore fitted along with the temperature [35].

### III. SETUP

When applying machine learning to an experimental setting, it is necessary to account for the whole system, including the experimental setup. Hence, there are two main approaches when it comes to training: (i) Training the model directly on the experimental data, whereby it automatically learns how the physical system looks like perceived through the experimental measurement apparatus [6], or (ii) simulating the experimental setup and thus training the model on simulated data [23].

The first approach is the most common, as it can circumvent any human assumptions or approximations between the neural network and the experimental interface. Especially for complex setups, it can be very challenging to theoretically describe all the experimental processes and account for all imperfections. Instead, directly connecting the model to the experimental setup circumvents the need for such approximations.

In this work we employ the alternative approach of simulating the experimental setup. In order for the model to accurately predict the temperature of a single realization, the training images must be labelled by the corresponding temperature. However, our current methods of thermometry are only capable of finding the temperature averaged over many samples. Since the temperature can fluctuate or drift throughout the experimental cycle, we have no knowledge of the temperature of the individual realizations, effectively ruling out the first approach. Additionally, simulating the absorption images is a lot quicker than producing them experimentally, and variation of key parameters can be controlled exactly. Thus, we are capable of producing large data sets necessary for a very dense sampling of the fluctuation spectra. However, in order to simulate the training data, good knowl-

edge of the imaging process is required. In the following we will briefly discuss the experimental setup, whereas the simulation of images is covered in the Appendix B and Ref. [33].

### A. The experimental setup

In the experiment, we use an atom chip trap [39–41] to realize a one-dimensional quasi-condensate of  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  atoms. The current carrying micro-fabricated wires on the chip surface generate a very large magnetic field gradient. Combined with an external bias field from surrounding coils, the wires create a highly anisotropic Ioffe-Pritchard type trap. The trap has two tightly confined (transverse) directions with a transverse trapping frequency of  $\omega_{\perp} = 2\pi \times 2.1\text{ kHz}$ , and one weakly confined (longitudinal or 1d) direction. The magnetic trap is parabolic along the weakly confined longitudinal direction (along the main chip wire). To achieve an arbitrary potential landscape in the longitudinal direction, we add an optical dipole potential [42]. The blue detuned laser light (wavelength of 660 nm) is shaped using a DMD before reaching the magnetically trapped atoms. In the context of this work, we employ a box trap yielding a uniform atomic density. Thus, after evaporative cooling of the atomic gas, a homogeneous quasi-condensate of 3000-10000 atoms at a temperature down to  $T = 20\text{ nK}$  is achieved.

To measure the system, the atomic gas is released from all traps and allowed to expand freely for either 2 ms or 11.2 ms. Immediately thereafter, the absorption image is taken along one of the transverse directions of the cloud (parallel to the chip surface). For the imaging light we employ the  $D_2$  line and use intensities around 30% of saturation. The numerical aperture (NA) of our transverse imaging system is about 0.2, and the exposure time used for the image is  $75\ \mu\text{s}$ . In figure 1 an illustration of the imaging process and an exemplar absorption image can be found.

### B. The neural network model

When setting up a neural network model, the parameterization of the problem is crucial. The absorption images taken in the experiment yield the density of the condensate integrated over one of its transverse axis, i.e. its 2d density. However, the density ripples exists only along the longitudinal axis of the condensate. Therefore, for the input of the network, we integrate out the transverse axis, leaving only the 1d density profile. The density profile is then fed as input to the neural network model.

The first section of the network consist of three 1d-convolutional layers, used to identify features in the density profiles. The layers have 16 filters each, a stride length of 1, and kernel sizes of  $\{3, 3, 5\}$ . We found that this particular combination of kernel sizes yielded the

| Layer          | Parameters                                 |
|----------------|--|
| Conv1D         | filters = 16, kernel size = 3, strides = 1 |
| MaxPooling1D   | pool size = 2, strides = 1                 |
| Conv1D         | filters = 16, kernel size = 3, strides = 1 |
| MaxPooling1D   | pool size = 2, strides = 1                 |
| Conv1D         | filters = 16, kernel size = 5, strides = 1 |
| Flatten        |  |
| Dense          | size = 200                                 |
| Dropout        | dropout rate = 0.5                         |
| Dense          | size = 200                                 |
| Dropout        | dropout rate = 0.5                         |
| Dense          | size = 200                                 |
| Dense (output) | size = 2                                   |

TABLE I. Neural network architecture. The activation function of each layer is the ReLU function [43]. Each kernel is initialized using the Xavier uniform scheme [46] and uses L2 regularization.

best performance of the network. For the activation function we employ the ReLU function [43]. Between each convolutional layer is a MaxPooling layer of size 2 with stride length 1. A more compact network can be realized by omitting the MaxPooling layers and employing a longer stride length in the convolutional layers [44], however, we found that this approach negatively affected our predictions. Following the first section, are three dense layers for processing the extracted features. Each layer contains 200 nodes and uses the ReLU activation function. Between each dense layer is placed a Dropout layer [45] with a dropout rate of 0.5. We found that without the high dropout rate, the mode was rather prone to overfitting. For the same reason, L2-regularization is employed on all kernels. For kernel initialization the Xavier uniform scheme [46] was used. See figure 1 for an illustration of the network and table I for a summary of the network architecture.

Due to the stochastic nature of the fluctuations in the condensate, exactly determining the temperature from a single image is practically impossible, as the fluctuations of a single realization only samples a small portion of the underlying fluctuation spectrum. Therefore, we have designed and trained the network to also return an uncertainty of the temperature estimate. This is achieved by outputting a normal distribution for the temperature probability of a given condensate, parameterized by two values  $\mu_T$  and  $\sigma_T$ , denoting the mean and standard deviation of the normal distribution, respectively. Since both parameters are positive, we employ the softplus activation function  $f(x) = \log(1 + e^x)$  for the output layer with two nodes [47]. To attain the desired behavior, we trained our model using the negative-log-likelihood func-

tion of our output distribution as the loss

$$\text{loss}(T) = \log(\sigma_T) + \frac{1}{2\sigma_T^2} (T - \mu_T)^2, \quad (11)$$

where  $T$  is the target temperature. The likelihood function maximizes the overlap between the output distribution and the target, while the logarithm negates the possibility of numerical underflow [48].

At the end of training,  $\sigma_T$  can be considered an uncertainty estimate of the models own temperature prediction, which is evident from eq. (11): If the model is uncertain of the temperature, it will output a wide distribution (large  $\sigma_T$ ) to minimize the contribution of the second term in eq. (11) scaling as the error of the estimate squared. Conversely, if the model is certain of its prediction, the error is likely small, whereby the minimum loss is obtained for a narrow distribution (small  $\sigma_T$  minimizing the first term of eq. (11)). Even for a perfect model,  $\sigma_T$  won't be vanishing, as the inherent randomness of the fluctuations combined with the sparse sampling makes an exact temperature prediction impossible. Hence, once the model has been trained, the only way of reducing the uncertainty of a single prediction is by increasing the number of sampled points. This can be achieved by either increasing the length of the condensate or improving the imaging resolution, both leading to more pixels of data. Alternatively, the results of multiple predictions can be combined, providing an estimate of the mean temperature of a batch of  $N$  realizations

$$\bar{\mu}_T = \sum_{i=1}^N w^{(i)} \mu_T^{(i)}. \quad (12)$$

Here,  $\mu_T^{(i)}$  are the individual predictions, and  $w^{(i)} = (\sigma_T^{(i)})^{-2} / \sum_i (\sigma_T^{(i)})^{-2}$  are a set of weights determined by the uncertainties. Similarly, a weighted uncertainty of the mean estimate can be computed following

$$\Delta_T = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_i w^{(i)} (\mu_T^{(i)} - \bar{\mu}_T)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (13)$$

In a typical experimental scenario, the number of atoms in the condensate and its temperature fluctuate between each realization. Therefore, we trained the network for many different combinations of these parameters, with the temperature ranging from 10 nK to 120 nK in steps of 10 nK and the number of atoms ranging from 4000 to 10000 in steps of 2000. We also varied the length of the box-trap from 50  $\mu\text{m}$  to 150  $\mu\text{m}$  in steps of 25  $\mu\text{m}$ . For each combination of these three parameters 500 density profiles were simulated. Meanwhile, parameters like the imaging intensity and the free expansion time of the condensate are kept constant, and separate neural networks are trained for selected values of these parameters. For the training, we found that employing a batch size of 64 with the Adam optimizer [49] with a learning rate of 0.001 yielded consistent convergence of the loss function

after roughly 40 epochs. The training and validation data (10% of the training data chosen randomly at the start of training) would converge to the same value, showing no signs of overfitting. Thus, each model was trained for a total of 50 epochs with no other stopping criteria. For more details including benchmarking of the trained models, see the Appendix A.

#### IV. RESULTS

Before employing the trained neural networks on experimental data, we need to assess their performance by testing them in a more controlled environment, i.e. on simulated data. Thus, we generate a data set with temperatures ranging from 10 nK to 115 nK in steps of 15 nK, number of atoms ranging from 4000 to 10000 in steps of 3000, and lengths of the box-trap from 50  $\mu\text{m}$  to 150  $\mu\text{m}$  in steps of 50  $\mu\text{m}$ . For each combination of parameters, we simulate 200 profiles. For each of the above temperatures  $T$ , we randomly draw a single profile, feed it to the neural network, and obtain a prediction of the temperature in the form of the normal distribution parameterized by  $\mu_T^{(i)}$  and  $\sigma_T^{(i)}$ . We repeat this process  $M = 50$  times for both 2 ms and 11.2 ms expansion time (TOF). We then quantify the accuracy of the networks predictions by computing the root-mean-square error (RMSE)

$$\text{RMSE}(T) = \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M (\mu_T^{(i)} - T)^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (14)$$

and mean error (ME)

$$\text{ME}(T) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M (\mu_T^{(i)} - T), \quad (15)$$

which we have plotted in figures 2(a) and 2(b), respectively.

Starting with figure 2(a), we observe an RMSE around 15 nK to 20 nK across most temperatures, except for the high temperatures, where it is significantly worse. The reason therefore is a bias in the model introduced through the selection of training data: Since the lowest and highest temperatures seen by the model during training are 10 nK and 120 nK, respectively, the model will almost never return an estimate outside these extremums, thus introducing a bias. Indeed, the bias can clearly be seen in figure 2(b), where we plot the mean error. For the lower temperatures the model is slightly positively biased, whereby predictions for profiles at  $T = 10$  nK produce an RMSE and ME of equal magnitude, indicating a very consistent overestimation of the temperature. A more significant bias can be found at higher temperatures, where the larger variations in the density ripples patterns makes temperature estimations more difficult. At  $T = 115$  nK, we again find an RMSE and ME of equal magnitude, here with a large negative bias. The much




FIG. 2. Performance of neural network models on simulated data for 2 ms and 11.2 ms expansion time (TOF). (a) Root-mean-square error (RMSE, eq. (14)) and (b) mean error (ME, eq. (15)) of the neural networks individual prediction  $\mu_T$  (solid lines) using 50 randomly drawn density profiles for each temperature. The dashed lines mark the (a) root-mean-square error and (b) mean error of the weighted mean prediction  $\bar{\mu}_T$  over  $N = 10$  profiles, where 50 randomly drawn sets of profiles were used. The grey boxes mark the temperatures of the training data. (c) Mean value of the uncertainties  $\sigma_T$  for the 50 predictions on single density profiles. The green shaded region indicates the range of condensate temperatures typically realized in the experiment.

greater bias found at higher temperatures is reflected in the RMSE, which is significantly larger for higher temperatures. Given the loss in accuracy due to the bias of the model, it is advisable to include training examples at temperatures outside the typical range of the experiment. Indeed, condensate temperatures in our experiment are mainly in the 20 nK to 90 nK regime, where the network is the least biased, as indicated by the green shaded region in the figure.

In figure 2(c) we plot the mean value of the standard deviations  $\sigma_T^{(i)}$ , indicating the uncertainty of the models predictions. For temperatures below 100 nK, the mean value of  $\sigma_T$  is similar to (although consistently higher than) the RMSE, confirming that the model is capable of accurately estimating its own uncertainty. Furthermore, at lower temperatures the uncertainty scales with the square root of the temperature, in accordance

to the variance of the thermal expectation value of the condensate fluctuations, eqs. (6) and (7). This indicates that the model indeed uses the fluctuations as observable. Further, the uncertainties for the shorter expansion times are consistently larger, as the density ripples patterns contrast is lower here. For higher temperatures the mean value of  $\sigma_T$  drops below the corresponding RMSE, indicating that the loss function has not been properly optimized in this temperature range. The reason therefore lies in the significant bias introduced by the cutoff at 120 nK in the training data.

Combining multiple individual temperature estimates via eq. (12) can reduce the error significantly. Thus, we repeat the process above but now sample  $N = 10$  profiles at a time and compute the weighted mean of the predictions  $\bar{\mu}_T$  and the uncertainty  $\Delta_T$  thereof. Again, we repeat this process  $M = 50$  times and compute both the RMSE and the ME, replacing the individual prediction with the mean prediction in eq. (14) and eq. (15), respectively. The results are plotted in figures 2(a) and 2(b) as dashed lines. For temperatures in the range 25 nK to 85 nK, where the single-profile bias is generally small, we observe a significant reduction in the RMSE with values as low as 5 nK being recorded. The bias of the mean temperature estimate within said range is similarly small, showing great promise for practical application, as  $N = 10$  profiles is already an order of magnitude below the usual number of density profiles used for density ripples thermometry. For higher temperatures, the bias of the model is so severe that increasing the number of examined profiles barely improves the accuracy of the temperature estimates. It is therefore critical to train the neural network at temperatures far beyond the regime of the experiment in order to limit any biases within the temperature range of interest.

Note, the benchmarking performed here does not consider variations in the temperature within the sample, which often occur in an experimental setting. For further benchmarking on simulated data with varying temperature, see Appendix A.

We are now ready to apply the networks on experimental data and compare their performance with the standard density ripples thermometry [35]. We consider a measurement of a condensate of 10000 atoms trapped in a 100  $\mu\text{m}$  box-trap followed by 11.2 ms of free expansion. The measurement was repeated 180 times, each requiring a separate realization of the condensate to be created. The intensity of the imaging light in the region of the condensate was at 26% of saturation, whereby we employ a neural network trained at 30% of saturation. However, we found that the neural networks were rather insensitive to the imaging intensity for large expansion times, whereby a model trained at 20% saturation yielded only slightly colder predictions.

We wish to test the accuracy of the two methods of thermometry at various number of measurement repetitions. Therefore, we proceed as follows: First, a subset of size  $N$  is drawn randomly from the full set of measured




FIG. 3. Benchmark of thermometry with neural network model and density ripples method on experimental data taken at 11.2 ms expansion time. Subsets of different sizes are sampled from the set of measured profiles, and each subset is analyzed using the two approaches. The process is repeated 20 times for each sample size. (a) Predicted mean temperature of subset averaged over all repetitions. The extend of the shaded rectangles mark the uncertainty  $2\Delta_T$  of the mean predictions, also averaged over all repetitions. (b) The standard deviation of the predicted mean temperatures.




FIG. 4. Application of neural network model on experimentally measured profiles after 2 ms expansion time. The data was taken immediately prior to the data presented in fig. 3. The points indicate the temperature predictions of the individual profiles  $\mu_T^{(i)}$ , while the error bars denote the individual uncertainties  $\sigma_T^{(i)}$ . The solid line marks the mean  $\bar{\mu}_T$  of the individual predictions, and the dashed lines mark the uncertainty  $\Delta_T$  of the mean.

density profiles. For the given subset, its mean temperature  $\bar{\mu}_T$  and the uncertainty thereof  $\Delta_T$  are estimated. The process of sampling and estimating is repeated 20 times for a number of batch sizes  $N$ . For each batch size, we compute the mean of the estimates and plot them in figure 3(a). We observe that for large batch sizes, the two methods converge to practically the same temperature around 40 nK. The neural network exhibits consistently smaller uncertainties than density ripples thermometry. However, since the uncertainties are computed in different ways between the two methods, comparing the two is not straightforward. As mentioned earlier, the uncertainty of the neural networks prediction of the mean temperature is given by eq. (13), while for the density ripples it is produced by taking the standard deviation of  $N$  bootstrapping samples. Nevertheless, it appears like the uncertainties of both methods converge to their final value for batch sizes of  $N \gtrsim 100$ .

To discuss the precision of the temperature estimations we compute the standard deviation of the 20 temperature estimates for each batch size, indicating how much the predictions of the two methods vary for a given number of profiles. The results are plotted in figure 3(b). We here observe a systematically better performance by the neural network: The standard deviation for both decreases proportional to  $N^{-1/2}$ , however, the neural network exhibits a precision equal to the density ripples thermometry but needing only half as many profiles. Thus, even for few measurement repetitions, we can expect consistent predictions from the neural network. Note, the standard deviations plotted in figure 3(b) are quite similar to the mean of the uncertainties  $\Delta_T$ , indicated by the height of the shaded bars in figure 3(a). This applies for both the neural network and density ripples thermometry. Given that the former estimate its uncertainty via eq. (13), and the latter estimate it by taking the standard deviation over bootstrapping samples, the similarity is perhaps not so surprising. Finally, an additional benefit of the neural network is that its temperature estimate is practically instant, once the network has been trained. Meanwhile, the density ripples thermometry can take several minutes to produce an estimate for a set of profiles.

Next, we turn to the thermometry of the condensate after only 2 ms expansion time, where the measured longitudinal density profile has barely changed from its in-trap shape. Hence, the contrast of the density ripples pattern is very low, meaning both the Bogoliubov density and phase fluctuations of the condensate contribute to the measured fluctuations in the profiles. Due to the low contrast, the density ripples thermometry does not apply. We consider data taken immediately prior to the one presented in figure 3. Therefore, both the temperature and atom number should be very similar. For this shorter expansion time, the atomic cloud is closer to the chip surface upon imaging and a bit offset from the center of the imaging beam. Hence, the intensity of the imaging light shone on the cloud was around 23% of saturation, whereby we employ a neural network trained at

20% saturation. Lastly, only 17 images were taken for this measurement.

The thermometry results are plotted in figure 4, showing both the temperature estimate of the individual profiles and the overall estimate given by the mean. Immediately, we observe a very large variation in the individual estimates. It is important to stress that this large variation is most likely not due to a wildly fluctuating temperature of the condensate, but rather reflects the difficulty of estimating the temperature (also seen by the large uncertainties of the individual predictions). Compared to the large expansion times, the fluctuations along  $z$  in the *in-situ* density profiles are much smaller, yielding a much worse signal to noise ratio. As a result, the uncertainties of the individual estimates are generally greater. Indeed, we observe similar behavior when benchmarking the neural network model on simulated data (see Appendix A). However, the mean prediction of  $\bar{\mu}_T = 32$  nK with the uncertainty  $\Delta_T = 3.1$  nK is still relatively close to the converged temperature estimate of 40 nK from the measurement with large expansion time.

While demonstrating a proof of concept, the current precision of the neural network for images taken at short expansion time is insufficient for application in the experimental setup. One way to improve its precision is through improvement of the signal to noise ratio. This can be achieved by a modification of the simulated images used for the training of the network. Since the length of the condensate varies, the simulated images were chosen to always be square for convenience. As a side effect, a square region also had to be selected from the measured images, in order for the noise levels to match. However, for longer condensates, this causes a large region of the image to be shot-noise filled background. In contrast, the density ripples thermometry extracts the density profile only from the region of the absorption image absolutely closest to the image of the cloud. Cropping the training images to the edges of the cloud should therefore reduce the noise in the extracted density profiles. Another increase in precision could be gained by building a new network, which takes multiple density profiles as input, thus sampling a larger number of fluctuations at a time.

## V. CONCLUSION

We have designed and trained neural network models to estimate the temperature of individual realizations of one-dimensional Bose gases in the quasi-condensate regime. The models have been trained on simulated data and benchmarked on both simulated and experimental data. When applied on simulated data, we find that individual predictions of the models within the temperature range of the experiment have an root-mean-square error of 15-20 nK, while an error of only 5 nK can be achieved when comparing predictions on 10 or more images. Further, the errors of the individual predictions are within the models estimate of its own uncertainty. For

thermometry at long expansion times on experimental data, the neural network model surpasses the established method of density ripples thermometry. We observe the neural network achieving the same precision needing only half the amount of samples, thus drastically reducing the time required to perform a thermometry measurement. At short expansion times, the precision of the network is considerable worse given the poor signal-to-noise ratio. Nevertheless, the model can still provide accurate estimates of the mean temperature. By employing tighter cropping of the images or allowing network inputs of multiple profiles, further improvements in performance should be possible. Our work demonstrates the potential gain of incorporating neural networks into the analysis of data from cold gas experiments. Besides for purposes of thermometry, the network can easily be reconfigured for the extraction of other parameters.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

F.M., J. Sabino., and F.C. acknowledge the support of the Doctoral Program CoQuS. This research was supported by the ESQ (Erwin Schrödinger Center for Quantum Science and Technology) Discovery programme, hosted by the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAW), the SFB 1225 'ISOQUANT' (grant number I3010-N27), financed by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), and the Wiener Wissenschafts- und Technologiefonds (WWTF) project No MA16-066 (SEQUEX). We thank Søren Meldgaard for enlightening discussions.

### Appendix A: Benchmarking the neural network on simulated data

In this section we benchmark of the neural network model on simulated data emulating a realistic scenario, where both atom number and temperature of the condensate can fluctuate. For this, we generate a new set of test data: For a box of fixed length of  $100 \mu\text{m}$  we select a random number of atoms from a normal distribution with mean 6000 and a standard deviation of 300, and a random temperature from another normal distribution with mean 50 nK and a standard deviation of 10 nK. We will treat this data set in a similar manner to the experimental data set presented in the main text.

In figures 5(a) and 5(c) the individual predictions of the model on 10 randomly drawn profiles are shown, for 2 ms and 11.2 ms expansion time, respectively. We observe the true temperature of the condensate in most cases being within the uncertainty of the models prediction. However, the individual uncertainties  $\sigma_T^{(i)}$  are relatively large in the case of 2 ms expansion time, meaning an estimate 25 nK off the true temperature is still within the uncertainty. Again, we can calculate the weighted mean temperature of the subset  $\bar{\mu}_T$ . For both expansion times, we observe the true mean temperature of the

underlying distribution being correctly estimated within the weighted uncertainty  $\Delta_T$ .

In figures 5(b) and 5(d), subsets of various sizes  $N$  are drawn and an estimate of the mean temperature is made. For each  $N$  this is repeated 20 times, and the averages of the computed values of  $\bar{\mu}_T$  and  $\Delta_T$  are plotted in the figure. For comparison, we also plot both the mean and the standard deviation of the temperature of all the samples within a given set size. For set sizes of  $N = 20$  and greater, we observe good agreement between the estimate of the mean provided by the neural network and the true mean temperature of the sampled profiles. The models for both expansion times exhibit a small positive bias, as the predicted mean is almost always a little higher than the true mean. This is consistent with the benchmark performed in the main text.

## Appendix B: Generating artificial absorption images

The process of simulating images comprises of two main steps: First, the state of an ultracold, trapped Bose gas is calculated. As discussed in the main text, the phase and density fluctuations of the condensate can be described by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process [38]. Next, using the phase-density representation [12], we obtain the wavefunction of a single realization. For each set of condensate variables (box length, atom number, temperature) we generate many individual realizations of the wavefunction, thereby sampling as many different fluctuations as possible. Finally, we simulate the experimental measurement process of the cold Bose gas, namely the free expansion of the gas followed by the absorption imaging. Note, the free expansion is only an approximation, as interactions between the atoms still take place in the early stages of the expansion, where the gas is still relatively dense. The simulation of the imaging process is described in great detail in Ref. [33]. Hence, we will here simply summarize the various steps taken and the different effects accounted for.

### a. Absorption of the imaging light.

In the experiment we employ absorption imaging, meaning that for each measurement we take two images; one of the atomic cloud and a second image of only the imaging light. By comparing the measured light intensities of the two images, the light absorption of the atomic cloud, and thereby the atomic density integrated along the imaging direction, can be inferred using the Beer-Lambert law. If  $z$  is the direction of imaging the Beer-Lambert law reads

$$\frac{dI(x, y, z)}{dz} = -\sigma n(x, y, z)I(x, y, z), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $I$  is the intensity of the imaging light,  $n$  is the atomic density, and  $\sigma$  is the absorption cross section for

the given transition. Upon switching on the imaging light, the populations of different  $m_F$  states will rearrange themselves, eventually reaching a dynamic equilibrium. In our imaging system, a linear polarization along the quantization axis of the atoms is employed, causing the dynamic equilibrium hyperfine populations to form an effective two-level system. The transition in this effective two-level system has an effective absorption cross section, given by the on-resonance cross section  $\sigma_0$  reduced by a factor of  $\alpha = 0.54$  [50]. The lower absorption causes the saturation intensity to increase proportionally. Thus, the total absorption cross section reads

$$\sigma = \frac{\alpha\sigma_0}{1 + \alpha \frac{I}{I_0^{\text{sat}}}}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

For the transition used, the on-resonance saturation intensity is  $I_0^{\text{sat}} = 16.6933 \text{ W/m}^2$ , and the on-resonance cross section is  $\sigma_0 = 2.905 \times 10^{-13} \text{ m}^2$ .

By integrating the Beer-Lambert law of eq. (B1) along the imaging direction, one can solve for the integrated atomic density, yielding

$$\tilde{n}(x, y) = \frac{1}{\sigma_0} \left[ -\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln \left( \frac{I_a(x, y)}{I_0(x, y)} \right) + \frac{I_0(x, y) - I_a(x, y)}{I_0^{\text{sat}}} \right]. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Here,  $I_0$  and  $I_a$  are the intensity profiles of the imaging light before and after having passed through the atomic cloud, respectively. In practice,  $I_a$  is obtained from the picture of the cloud, while  $I_0$  is the picture without the cloud present. For the purpose of simulating images, the Beer-Lambert law can also be used to compute the intensity profile of the imaging light after having passed through the atomic cloud

$$I_a(x, y) = \frac{I_0^{\text{sat}}}{\alpha} W \left[ \frac{\alpha I_0(x, y)}{I_0^{\text{sat}}} e^{\frac{\alpha I_0(x, y)}{I_0^{\text{sat}}} - \alpha \tilde{n}(x, y) \sigma_0} \right], \quad (\text{B4})$$

where  $W$  denotes the Lambert-W function on its principal branch.

### b. Recoil blurring.

During the imaging process, the atoms absorb photons from the imaging light and have a probability of spontaneously re-emitting them. Since the direction of these re-emitted photons is random, their recoil causes the atom to move following a random walk leading to blurring of the image. The process above causes a continuous deformation of the cloud throughout the exposure time of the imaging. We estimate the blurring by discretizing the deformation and thus subdividing the exposure time into small time slices  $\Delta t$ . If we let  $N_{\text{abs}}$  be the number of photons absorbed by a single atom during the time  $\Delta t$ , the expectation value of the square distances travelled in said duration is [51]

$$\langle |\vec{r}|^2 \rangle_{\text{abs}} \approx v_{\text{rec}}^2 \Delta t^2 \frac{N_{\text{abs}}}{3}, \quad (\text{B5})$$




FIG. 5. Benchmark of both the individual and mean prediction of the neural network on simulated data. Left column: Individual and mean prediction of the neural network on 10 profiles randomly drawn from the data set. The blue dots show the  $\mu_T^{(i)}$  predictions of the model, while the error bars mark the uncertainties  $\sigma_T^{(i)}$ . Right column: Subsets of different sizes  $N$  are drawn from the overall data set, and the weighted mean temperature prediction  $\bar{\mu}_T$  and uncertainty thereof  $\Delta_T$  are computed. The blue data points and error bars show the average over 20 repetitions for  $\bar{\mu}_T$  and  $\Delta_T$ , respectively. The shaded bars indicate the mean and standard deviation of the actual temperatures of the sampled profiles. (a,b) TOF = 2 ms. (c,d) TOF = 11.2 ms.

where  $v_{\text{rec}}$  is the recoil velocity. The blurring of the cloud can then be estimated by convolving the 2d atomic density with a Gaussian of width

$$\sigma_{\text{rec}}^2 = \frac{1}{3} \langle |\vec{r}|^2 \rangle_{\text{abs}}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

### c. Imaging resolution of an expanded cloud.

In order to simulate the image formation using a coherent light source we need to compute the coherent transfer function  $c(k_x, k_y)$ , which relates the image in the object plane to the light field amplitude in the object plane, i.e. the light field immediately after having passed through the atomic cloud. The coherent transfer function also captures the resolution of the imaging system, which, in part, is determined by the numerical aperture (NA). A higher NA means better in-focus resolution but worse depth of focus. Thus, when imaging an extended object, such as the condensate after free expansion, the optical resolution can be substantially reduced. Let us assume the density of the atomic cloud after free expansion and along the imaging direction to be a Gaussian of width  $w$ . Assuming a semi-transparent cloud and a circular aperture, the effective coherent transfer function

reads [52]

$$c_{\text{eff}}(k_x, k_y) \propto \Theta\left(\frac{\text{NA}}{\lambda} - k_t\right) e^{-\left(\pi \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}} k_t^2 w\right)^2} e^{-i\pi \lambda k_t^2 z_0}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where  $k_t^2 = k_x^2 + k_y^2$ ,  $z_0$  is the distance from the center of the cloud to the imaging focus plane, and  $\lambda = 780$  nm is the wavelength of the imaging light. The first term in eq. (B7) represents the fundamental diffraction limit of the optical system, while the second term is the decrease in resolution due to the finite extend of the Gaussian cloud.

### d. Properties of the camera.

Lastly, we account for the properties of our camera. First, the intensity profiles of the imaging light are coarse grained by binning them according to the camera pixels, which have a length of  $1.05 \mu\text{m}$  in the object plane. Next, the quantum efficiency of the camera is accounted for. Finally, we account for the shot noise on images by assuming the arrival of photons at every pixel to follow a Poisson distribution.

[1] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, Deep learning, Nature **521**, 436 (2015).

[2] J. Carrasquilla and R. G. Melko, Machine learning phases of matter, Nat. Phys. **13**, 431 (2017).

- [3] E. P. Van Nieuwenburg, Y.-H. Liu, and S. D. Huber, Learning phase transitions by confusion, *Nat. Phys.* **13**, 435 (2017).
- [4] G. Carleo and M. Troyer, Solving the quantum many-body problem with artificial neural networks, *Science* **355**, 602 (2017).
- [5] X. Gao and L.-M. Duan, Efficient representation of quantum many-body states with deep neural networks, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1 (2017).
- [6] B. S. Rem, N. Käming, M. Tarnowski, L. Asteria, N. Fläschner, C. Becker, K. Sengstock, and C. Weitenberg, Identifying quantum phase transitions using artificial neural networks on experimental data, *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 917 (2019).
- [7] G. Torlai, B. Timar, E. P. L. van Nieuwenburg, H. Levine, A. Omran, A. Keesling, H. Bernien, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, M. D. Lukin, R. G. Melko, and M. Endres, Integrating neural networks with a quantum simulator for state reconstruction, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 230504 (2019).
- [8] A. Bohrdt, C. S. Chiu, G. Ji, M. Xu, D. Greif, M. Greiner, E. Demler, F. Grusdt, and M. Knap, Classifying snapshots of the doped hubbard model with machine learning, *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 921 (2019).
- [9] Y. Zhang, A. Mesaros, K. Fujita, S. Edkins, M. Hamidian, K. Ch'ng, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, J. S. Davis, E. Khatami, *et al.*, Machine learning in electronic-quantum-matter imaging experiments, *Nature* **570**, 484 (2019).
- [10] S. A. Meldgaard, E. L. Kolsbjerg, and B. Hammer, Machine learning enhanced global optimization by clustering local environments to enable bundled atomic energies, *J. Chem. Phys.* **149**, 134104 (2018).
- [11] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Many-body physics with ultracold gases, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 885 (2008).
- [12] C. Mora and Y. Castin, Extension of bogoliubov theory to quasicondensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 053615 (2003).
- [13] O. A. Castro-Alvaredo, B. Doyon, and T. Yoshimura, Emergent hydrodynamics in integrable quantum systems out of equilibrium, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041065 (2016).
- [14] B. Bertini, M. Collura, J. De Nardis, and M. Fagotti, Transport in out-of-equilibrium  $xxz$  chains: Exact profiles of charges and currents, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 207201 (2016).
- [15] U. Schollwöck, The density-matrix renormalization group, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 259 (2005).
- [16] P. Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Sénéchal, *Conformal field theory*, Graduate texts in contemporary physics (Springer, 1997).
- [17] T. Schweigler, V. Kasper, S. Erne, I. Mazets, B. Rauer, F. Cataldini, T. Langen, T. Gasenzer, J. Berges, and J. Schmiedmayer, Experimental characterization of a quantum many-body system via higher-order correlations, *Nature* **545**, 323 (2017).
- [18] V. Gritsev, A. Polkovnikov, and E. Demler, Linear response theory for a pair of coupled one-dimensional condensates of interacting atoms, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 174511 (2007).
- [19] F. Møller, C. Li, I. Mazets, H.-P. Stimming, T. Zhou, Z. Zhu, X. Chen, and J. Schmiedmayer, Extension of the generalized hydrodynamics to the dimensional crossover regime, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 090602 (2021).
- [20] M. Schmitt and Z. Lenarčič, From observations to complexity of quantum states via unsupervised learning (2021), arXiv:2102.11328 [quant-ph].
- [21] A. J. Barker, H. Style, K. Luksch, S. Sunami, D. Garrick, F. Hill, C. J. Foot, and E. Bentine, Applying machine learning optimization methods to the production of a quantum gas, *Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol* **1**, 015007 (2020).
- [22] P. B. Wigley, P. J. Everitt, A. van den Hengel, J. W. Bastian, M. A. Sooriyabandara, G. D. McDonald, K. S. Hardman, C. D. Quinlivan, P. Manju, C. C. N. Kuhn, I. R. Petersen, A. N. Luiten, J. J. Hope, N. P. Robins, and M. R. Hush, Fast machine-learning online optimization of ultra-cold-atom experiments, *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 25890 (2016).
- [23] L. R. B. Picard, M. J. Mark, F. Ferlaino, and R. van Bijnen, Deep learning-assisted classification of site-resolved quantum gas microscope images, *Meas. Sci. Technol.* **31**, 025201 (2019).
- [24] G. Ness, A. Vainbaum, C. Shkedorov, Y. Florshaim, and Y. Sagi, Single-exposure absorption imaging of ultracold atoms using deep learning, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **14**, 014011 (2020).
- [25] L. Xu, J. S. Ren, C. Liu, and J. Jia, Deep convolutional neural network for image deconvolution, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 27, edited by Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K. Q. Weinberger (Curran Associates, Inc., 2014) pp. 1790–1798.
- [26] J. Esteve, J.-B. Trebbia, T. Schumm, A. Aspect, C. I. Westbrook, and I. Bouchoule, Observations of density fluctuations in an elongated bose gas: Ideal gas and quasicondensate regimes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 130403 (2006).
- [27] T. Jacqmin, J. Armijo, T. Berrada, K. V. Kheruntsyan, and I. Bouchoule, Sub-poissonian fluctuations in a 1d bose gas: From the quantum quasicondensate to the strongly interacting regime, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 230405 (2011).
- [28] J. Armijo, T. Jacqmin, K. V. Kheruntsyan, and I. Bouchoule, Probing three-body correlations in a quantum gas using the measurement of the third moment of density fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 230402 (2010).
- [29] M. Schemmer, A. Johnson, and I. Bouchoule, Monitoring squeezed collective modes of a one-dimensional bose gas after an interaction quench using density-ripple analysis, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 043604 (2018).
- [30] T. Langen, S. Erne, R. Geiger, B. Rauer, T. Schweigler, M. Kuhnert, W. Rohringer, I. E. Mazets, T. Gasenzer, and J. Schmiedmayer, Experimental observation of a generalized gibbs ensemble, *Science* **348**, 207 (2015).
- [31] M. Gring, M. Kuhnert, T. Langen, T. Kitagawa, B. Rauer, M. Schreitl, I. Mazets, D. A. Smith, E. Demler, and J. Schmiedmayer, Relaxation and prethermalization in an isolated quantum system, *Science* **337**, 1318 (2012).
- [32] T. Schweigler, M. Gluza, M. Tajik, S. Sotiriadis, F. Cataldini, S.-C. Ji, F. S. Møller, J. Sabino, B. Rauer, J. Eisert, and J. Schmiedmayer, Decay and recurrence of non-gaussian correlations in a quantum many-body system, *Nat. Phys.* 10.1038/s41567-020-01139-2 (2021).
- [33] T. Schweigler, *Correlations and dynamics of tunnel-coupled one-dimensional Bose gases*, Ph.D. thesis (2019), arXiv:1908.00422 [cond-mat.quant-gas].
- [34] A. Imambekov, I. E. Mazets, D. S. Petrov, V. Gritsev, S. Manz, S. Hofferberth, T. Schumm, E. Demler, and J. Schmiedmayer, Density ripples in expanding low-

- dimensional gases as a probe of correlations, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 033604 (2009).
- [35] S. Manz, R. Bücke, T. Betz, C. Koller, S. Hofferberth, I. E. Mazets, A. Imambekov, E. Demler, A. Perrin, J. Schmiedmayer, and T. Schumm, Two-point density correlations of quasicondensates in free expansion, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 031610 (2010).
- [36] M. Olshanii, Atomic scattering in the presence of an external confinement and a gas of impenetrable bosons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 938 (1998).
- [37] Eqs. (3) and (4) are derived assuming Neumann boundary conditions implying that the particle current vanishes on the boundary. This corresponds to the physical situation of having a hard-walled box.
- [38] H.-P. Stimming, N. J. Mauser, J. Schmiedmayer, and I. E. Mazets, Fluctuations and stochastic processes in one-dimensional many-body quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 015301 (2010).
- [39] J. Reichel and V. Vuletić, eds., *Atom Chips* (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany, 2011).
- [40] R. Folman, P. Kruger, J. Schmiedmayer, J. Denschlag, and C. Henkel, Microscopic atom optics: from wires to an atom chip (2008), arXiv:0805.2613 [quant-ph].
- [41] R. Folman, P. Krüger, D. Cassettari, B. Hessmo, T. Maier, and J. Schmiedmayer, Controlling cold atoms using nanofabricated surfaces: Atom chips, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4749 (2000).
- [42] M. Tajik, B. Rauer, T. Schweigler, F. Cataldini, J. ao Sabino, F. S. Møller, S.-C. Ji, I. E. Mazets, and J. Schmiedmayer, Designing arbitrary one-dimensional potentials on an atom chip, *Opt. Express* **27**, 33474 (2019).
- [43] V. Nair and G. E. Hinton, Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines, in *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-10)*, edited by J. Fürnkranz and T. Joachims (2010) pp. 807–814.
- [44] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, Deep residual learning for image recognition, in *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2016) pp. 770–778.
- [45] N. Srivastava, G. Hinton, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. Salakhutdinov, Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **15**, 1929 (2014).
- [46] X. Glorot and Y. Bengio, Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks, in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 9, edited by Y. W. Teh and M. Titterton (PMLR, Chia Laguna Resort, Sardinia, Italy, 2010) pp. 249–256.
- [47] The softplus function ensures that the outputs  $\mu_T$  and  $\sigma_T$  are positive. The softplus function has the same effect as the ReLU function, however, it is more numerically stable when employing logarithms in the loss function.
- [48] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep Learning*, Adaptive computation and machine learning (MIT Press, 2016).
- [49] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, Adam: A method for stochastic optimization (2017), arXiv:1412.6980 [cs.LG].
- [50] D. A. Steck, Rubidium 87 d line data (2015).
- [51] W. Ketterle, D. S. Durfee, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Making, probing and understanding Bose-Einstein condensates (1999), arXiv:cond-mat/9904034.
- [52] R. Bücke, A. Perrin, S. Manz, T. Betz, C. Koller, T. Plisson, J. Rottmann, T. Schumm, and J. Schmiedmayer, Single-particle-sensitive imaging of freely propagating ultracold atoms, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 103039 (2009).