

# Counting statistics of interfering Bose-Einstein condensates

A. L. Shelankov

*Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå and  
A. F. Ioffe Physico-Technical Institute, 194021 St. Petersburg, Russia*

J. Rammer

*Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå*

A method is presented that is able to predict the probability of outcomes of snapshot measurements, such as the images of the instantaneous particle density distribution in a quantum many-body system. It is shown that a gauge-like transformation of the phase of the many-body wave function allows one to construct a probability generating functional, the Fourier transform of which with respect to the “gauge” field returns the joint probability distribution to detect any given number of particles at various locations. The method is applied to the problem of interference of two independent clouds of Bose-Einstein condensates, where the initially separated clouds with fixed boson numbers expand and the density profile image of the overlapping clouds is registered. In the limit of large particle numbers, the probability to observe a particular image of the density profile is shown to be given by a sum of partial probability distributions, each of which corresponds to a noisy image of interference of two matter waves with definite phase difference. In agreement with earlier theoretical arguments, interference fringes are, therefore, expected in any single shot measurement, the fringe pattern randomly varying from run to run. These results conform to the physical picture where the Bose-Einstein clouds are in spontaneously symmetry broken states, the hidden phases of which are revealed by the density profile measurement via the position of the interference fringes.

Shortly after the achievement of creating a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) in a dilute gas of ultra-cold atoms, an experiment was performed where two independent clouds of BEC were brought to overlap in space, and the particle distribution of atoms measured. A snapshot picture of the density of the two overlapping clouds showed interference fringes analogous to the characteristic interference pattern of a double-slit experiment [1]. The text-book double-slit case is a repeated measurement performed on the same single system, and the fringes in the arrival pattern of the matter wave emerges only after many runs. On the contrary, the former interference fringes are present in a single snapshot picture of the density distribution of the overlapping condensates, with a phase, as determined from the fringe pattern, varying randomly between snapshots. This experimental result begs the old question [2] of how on earth two independent systems can exhibit knowledge of the relative phase of their wave functions. In the present context, this fundamental problem was analysed in Ref.[3] and Ref.[4]: Using various models and approaches, indeed it was shown that the behaviour of condensates with large number of particles is indistinguishable from the broken symmetry scenario where the condensate is described by a wave function with a definite, although unknown, phase. Since then, the problem has been attracting attention from many researchers (see [5, 6, 7, 8]) and references therein). The purpose of this paper is two-fold: First, we present a method, which we believe is most suitable for studying density fluctuations in macroscopic quantum systems, and second, we reanalyse the problem of interfering BEC clouds using the method.

Interfering BEC clouds provide probably a unique ex-

ample of a system with a large number of particles on which a measurement gives macroscopically distinguishable results that are unpredictable. Indeed, the interference images registered in identical experiments differ in the fringe position, and the macroscopic phase extracted from the image is random from run to run. For this reason, the standard description of macroscopic systems, where fluctuations are small and expectation values are representative, is not sufficient, and the information we seek is not an expectation value, but the probabilities for realisations of possible density profiles of BEC clouds. Such detailed information is normally not of concern for macroscopic systems, but is precisely the information needed for discussing the outcome of a density measurement on interfering BEC’s, viz. to extract a phase from an image, a global feature and an information which can not be extracted from local expectation values.

Our goal is to obtain directly the statistics of instantaneous measurements of particle distributions, the kind of information needed to describe snapshot experiments on many-body systems such as BEC’s [13]. Given a desired spatial resolution  $l_{x,y,z}$  in each of the three dimensions, we imagine a mesh in real space where the elementary volume is a  $l_x \times l_y \times l_z$  box of volume  $\Delta = l_x l_y l_z$ . At the finest level, either a particle or none is detected in each such pixel. The result of such a position measurement of the particle locations in a many-body system corresponds thus to zeros and ones attributed to each such pixel. Coarse-graining, *i.e.*, adding the observed particle content of nearby cells, the extend of which specifies a bin, will attribute a corresponding *integer* number of particles to each bin. The result of a snapshot measurement of the positions of the particles is thus specified

by a set of *integers*,  $\{n\} = n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k, \dots$  the number of particles detected in the bins located at positions  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \dots$  respectively. The size of the bin (e.g. the pixel of a CCD camera) determines the resolution of the image of the particle distribution.

Our aim is to find an efficient method for obtaining the probability distribution,  $P(\{n\})$ , for the various strings  $\{n\} = n_1, n_2, \dots$  of integer outcomes of the particle distributions for a general quantum system consisting of  $N$  particles.

To this end we employ the phase transformation of the wave function  $\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \rightarrow \hat{U}_\lambda \psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$  where, similar to a gauge transformation,

$$\hat{U}_\lambda \psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) = e^{i(\lambda(\mathbf{x}_1) + \dots + \lambda(\mathbf{x}_N))} \psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N). \quad (1)$$

(A related phase tagging was employed in an investigation of counting statistics developed for studying electric current noise in mesoscopic devices [9].) Tagging in this fashion the particles in the state  $|\psi\rangle$ , we construct the following functional of the phase field

$$\Phi[\lambda] = \langle \psi | \hat{U}_\lambda | \psi \rangle. \quad (2)$$

The Fourier transform of  $\Phi[\lambda]$  with respect to the ‘‘gauge field’’  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$  provides the probability distribution for strings, specifying the possible particle configurations.

Indeed, let the real function  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$  be piecewise constant in each of the bins where the number of particles  $n_k$  is counted, *i.e.*,  $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_k$  in the  $k$ -th bin. The functional  $\Phi[\lambda]$  becomes a function,  $\Phi(\{\lambda\})$  of the variables  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots \equiv \{\lambda\}$ . The probability distribution,  $P(\{n\})$ , is then obtained as the multidimensional Fourier transform with respect to the  $\lambda$  in each of the bins,

$$P(\{n\}) = \int_0^{2\pi} \mathcal{D}\lambda e^{-i \sum_k n_k \lambda_k} \Phi(\{\lambda\}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}\lambda$  denotes the product of the differentials,

$$\mathcal{D}\lambda \equiv \frac{d\lambda_1}{2\pi} \frac{d\lambda_2}{2\pi} \dots \frac{d\lambda_k}{2\pi} \dots, \quad (4)$$

and the  $2\pi$ -integration is performed with respect to each of the  $\lambda$ 's.

To validate this construction, we note that in accordance with general rules of quantum mechanics the probability  $P(\{n\})$ , *i.e.*, the joint probability that exactly  $n_k$  particles are found in the  $k$ -th bin,  $k = 1, 2, \text{etc}$ , is given by the integral,

$$P(\{n\}) = \int_{\{n\}} d\mathbf{x}_1 \dots d\mathbf{x}_N |\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)|^2, \quad (5)$$

where the region of integration, specified by the string  $\{n\} = n_1, n_2, \dots$  is restricted by the set of conditions that for any  $k = 1, 2, \text{etc}$  exactly  $n_k$  arguments of the wave function belong to the  $k$ -th bin.

The validity of the counting formula Eq. (3), where  $\Phi(\{\lambda\})$  is given by Eq. (2) with the piecewise constant  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ , is immediately seen since the Fourier transform in Eq. (3) has the effect that the unrestricted spatial integration in Eq. (2) is narrowed to the region  $\{n\}$  as in Eq. (5). This concludes our proof that the functional  $\Phi[\lambda]$  is the generating function for the particle distributions.

For future needs, we present Eq. (3) in a concise form as a functional integral with respect to the field  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$

$$P[n] = \int_0^{2\pi} \mathcal{D}\lambda e^{-i \int d\mathbf{x} n(\mathbf{x}) \lambda(\mathbf{x})} \Phi[\lambda], \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}\lambda$  is understood as in Eq. (4), and  $n(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_k n_k \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_k)$  specifies an arbitrary assignment of the bins filling or it may be viewed as a continuous density distribution  $n(\mathbf{x})$ .

We have thus achieved the goal of expressing the statistics of particle locations, not as customarily directly in terms of the absolute square of the wave function, but in such a fashion that the definite outcome of particle content detected in each bin,  $n_k$ , enters explicitly as parameters. The spatial resolution of the profile  $n(\mathbf{x})$  is controlled by the smoothness of the field  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$  one chooses when evaluating the functional  $\lambda$ -integration in Eq. (6). The formula, Eq. (3), thus provides the complete counting statistics of single shot particle distributions for an arbitrary many-body system. As an application of the method, we consider the counting statistics of interfering Bose-Einstein condensates. In this example, we restrict ourselves to the limit of non-interacting particles, neglecting correlation effects related to the depletion of the condensates.

First, we consider an isolated BEC cloud consisting of  $N$  bosons. For our purposes it will be convenient to build the Fock state of the cloud in the coherent state representation. Let  $|\phi(\mathbf{x})\rangle$  denote the state into which condensation occurs, and consider the coherent state  $|\phi_\theta\rangle$ ,

$$|\phi_\theta\rangle = e^{e^{i\theta} \int d\mathbf{x} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x})} |0\rangle, \quad \int d\mathbf{x} |\phi(\mathbf{x})|^2 = N \quad (7)$$

obtained by operating with the boson field  $\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x})$  on the vacuum state  $|0\rangle$ . [14] The Fock state  $|N\rangle$  where  $N$  bosons occupy the single particle mode  $\phi(\mathbf{x})$  is then obtained by projecting the coherent state, Eq. (7),

$$|N\rangle = c_N \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} e^{-i\theta N} |\phi_\theta\rangle \quad (8)$$

where  $c_N = \sqrt{N!/N^N}$  is the normalisation constant.

We then consider two initially separated clouds of bosons with particle numbers  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ , and where the particles occupy single particle states  $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\phi_2(\mathbf{x})$ , respectively. The many-body wave function of the two spatially non-overlapping clouds is simply the product of

the wave functions of the isolated clouds, and the corresponding quantum state,  $|\Psi\rangle = |N_1\rangle_1|N_2\rangle_2$ , is thus obtained expressing the Fock state in terms of the coherent state, according to

$$|\Psi\rangle = c_{12} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_1 d\theta_2}{(2\pi)^2} e^{-i(\theta_1 N_1 + \theta_2 N_2)} e^{\int d\mathbf{x} \psi_{\theta_1 \theta_2}(\mathbf{x}) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x})} |0\rangle \quad (9)$$

where

$$\psi_{\theta_1 \theta_2}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv e^{i\theta_1} \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) + e^{i\theta_2} \phi_2(\mathbf{x}) \quad (10)$$

and  $c_{12}$  is the normalisation constant,  $c_{12} = c_{N_1} c_{N_2}$ .

One may get the wrong impression that in the quantum state  $\Psi$ , Eq. (9), the bosons are in the superposition state  $\psi_{\theta_1 \theta_2}(\mathbf{x})$  of Eq. (10). However, unlike genuine superpositions, where a phase transformation like  $\phi_1 \rightarrow e^{i\varphi} \phi_1$  non-trivially changes the state, the same transformation of the many-body state in Eq. (9) amounts to an overall phase factor multiplication which does not change the value of any observable. In fact, the atoms in the two non-overlapping clouds are not yet even aware that they are identical species.

In the interference experiment, time evolution provides by the time of measurement,  $t_0$ , overlap of the initially separated clouds due to their expansion. If the atom-atom interaction is neglected, evolution of the many-body state  $|\Psi(t)\rangle$  amounts to the unitary evolution of the single particle states. Consequently, the expression Eq. (9) is valid for the state  $|\Psi(t)\rangle$  provided  $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$  are substituted by the evolved single-particle wave functions  $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ . The initial states  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are spatially separated, *i.e.*, locally the states satisfy  $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})\phi_2^*(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ , and are therefore trivially orthogonal. It follows from the unitarity of evolution that the spatially overlapping states  $\phi_1(\mathbf{x}, t)$  and  $\phi_2(\mathbf{x}, t)$  remain orthogonal at any time.

To simplify notation, we use Eq. (9) for the state  $|\Psi(t_0)\rangle$  of the clouds at the moment of measurement,  $t_0$ , with the understanding that in all formulae below  $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$  stand actually for  $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)$ ; the functions  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are orthogonal and normalised to the particle numbers  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  of the respective clouds.

Having specified the state of the system, we are in the position to obtain the probability for any possible particle configuration  $[n]$  from Eq. (6). To evaluate the functional  $\Phi[\lambda] = \langle \Psi | \hat{U}_\lambda | \Psi \rangle$  with  $|\Psi\rangle$  given by Eq. (9), we note that in terms of the field operator, the tagging of the particles by the phase field via the operation  $\hat{U}_\lambda | \Psi \rangle$  is enforced by its transformation according to

$$\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow e^{i\lambda(\mathbf{x})} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Using the Baker-Hausdorff formula [10] to calculate the matrix element  $\langle \Psi | \hat{U}_\lambda | \Psi \rangle$  we arrive after straightforward calculations at the expression for the particle probability

distribution

$$P[n(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{N_1! N_2!}{N_1^{N_1} N_2^{N_2}} \int_0^{2\pi N} \frac{d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi N)^2} \int \mathcal{D}\lambda \quad (11)$$

$$\times \exp \left[ \int d\mathbf{x} \left( e^{i\lambda(\mathbf{x})} \psi_{\theta'}^*(\mathbf{x}) \psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - i n(\mathbf{x}) \lambda(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right]$$

where for brevity continuum notation is used, and

$$\psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\nu_2 \theta} \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) + e^{-i\nu_1 \theta} \phi_2(\mathbf{x}) \quad (12)$$

with  $\nu_{1,2} = N_{1,2}/N$ ,  $N = N_1 + N_2$ . [15] Eq. (11) refers only to configurations  $n(\mathbf{x})$  which are physical, *i.e.*,  $\int d\mathbf{x} n(\mathbf{x}) = N$ , and otherwise the probability is identically zero as observed in the process of obtaining Eq. (11) from Eq. (6). For brevity, in Eq. (11) and below we omit the Kronecker symbol expressing this property.

The formula Eq. (11), allows one to find the particle probability distribution for two Fock state clouds with arbitrary particle numbers  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ .

The functional  $\lambda$ -integral is understood as the multi-dimensional one in Eq. (3). In our approximation, where the interaction is ignored, the integral factorises and can be easily evaluated. Appropriately choosing the size of the bins, any spatial resolution for the density profile  $n(\mathbf{x})$  can be considered.

For illustration, we first look at the simplest case where each ‘‘cloud’’ consists of a single boson,  $N_1 = N_2 = 1$ , in the state  $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\phi_2(\mathbf{x})$ , respectively. In this case, only two types of particle configurations exist: (i) both particles are located in the bin around point  $\mathbf{x}_a$ ;  $\{n(\mathbf{x})\}_{aa} = 0_1, 0_2, \dots, 2_a, \dots$  where all particle numbers  $n_k$  are zero except for bin  $a$  where  $n_a = 2$ . (ii) One of the particles is located in the bin near  $\mathbf{x}_a$  and the other one is in a different bin  $\mathbf{x}_b$ ;  $\{n(\mathbf{x})\}_{ab} = 0_1, 0_2, \dots, 1_a, \dots, 1_b, \dots$ , *i.e.*,  $n_k = 0$  excepting  $n_a = n_b = 1$ . Denote by  $P_{aa}$  and  $P_{ab}$  the probabilities for the corresponding particle configurations, and in order to single out the dependence on the bin volume present them as  $P_{aa} \equiv \mathcal{P}_{aa} \Delta^2$  and  $P_{ab} \equiv \mathcal{P}_{ab} \Delta^2$ , assuming the bins small so that  $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$  do not vary within a bin. To obtain the probabilities for these configurations, one integrates in Eq. (11) with respect to the field  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$  assuming that the latter is piecewise constant in each of the bins. After further integration with respect to the phases  $\theta$  and  $\theta'$ , one obtains

$$\mathcal{P}_{aa} = 2 |\phi_1(\mathbf{x}_a) \phi_2(\mathbf{x}_a)|^2, \quad (13)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{ab} = |\phi_1(\mathbf{x}_a) \phi_2(\mathbf{x}_b) + \phi_1(\mathbf{x}_b) \phi_2(\mathbf{x}_a)|^2. \quad (14)$$

Here, the coefficient of 2 in the expression for  $\mathcal{P}_{aa}$  represents the well-known boson bunching effect [10]. The cross term,  $2\Re \phi_1(\mathbf{x}_a) \phi_1^*(\mathbf{x}_b) \phi_2(\mathbf{x}_b) \phi_2^*(\mathbf{x}_a)$ , in  $\mathcal{P}_{ab}$  describes the expected Hanbury Brown and Twiss effect [10]. Also, one observes that  $\mathcal{P}_{ab|b \rightarrow a} = 2\mathcal{P}_{aa}$ ; this is a necessary property to guarantee the correct dependence of  $\mathcal{P}_{aa}$  on the choice of the mesh size.

Next we turn to the case of interest, two interfering macroscopic Bose-Einstein condensates where the number of particles in each cloud is large,  $N_{1,2} \gg 1$ . The main

contribution to the phase integral in Eq. (11) comes in that case from the region  $\theta' \approx \theta$ , and the particle probability distribution becomes

$$P[n] = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \mathcal{P}_\theta[n] \quad (15)$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_\theta[n] = \sqrt{2\pi N} \int \mathcal{D}\lambda e^{\int d\mathbf{x} ((e^{i\lambda(\mathbf{x})} - 1)\rho_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - in(\mathbf{x})\lambda(\mathbf{x}))} \quad (16)$$

with

$$\rho_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = |e^{i\theta} \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) + \phi_2(\mathbf{x})|^2. \quad (17)$$

Within the approximation of non-interacting bosons the formula Eq. (15) provides the complete counting statistics of snapshot particle distribution measurements in Fock states, *i.e.*, a state where the particle numbers  $N_{1,2}$  of the condensates are large and separately fixed and their phases are completely indefinite.

To get insight into the content of formula Eq. (15), we note that the distribution  $P[n]$  is built by a family of partial (normalised) distributions  $\mathcal{P}_\theta[n]$ . Obviously, the part of the configuration  $[n]$ -space where the probability  $P[n]$  is appreciable, is spanned by the corresponding subspaces generated by the  $\mathcal{P}_\theta[n]$ 's,  $0 < \theta < 2\pi$ , and we first discuss the partial contributions  $\mathcal{P}_\theta[n]$ . One can check by comparison that  $\mathcal{P}_\theta[n]$  coincides with the distribution of the outcomes of  $N$  independent identical double-slit-type experiments where the position  $\mathbf{x}$  of a single particle in the superposition state  $\psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\theta} \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) + \phi_2(\mathbf{x})$  is measured. At the individual pixel level, the distribution of the number of particles  $n_k$  registered in the  $k$ 'th bin is Poissonian reflecting the intrinsic randomness at the level of quantum mechanics. When typical counts  $n_k$ 's are large, the shot noise fluctuations in the  $n_k$ 's are relatively small. Asymptotically, at  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_\theta[n(\mathbf{x})]$  thus selects the configurations where the density  $n(\mathbf{x})$  equals (up to shot noise) the density expectation value with respect to the wave function building  $\rho_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  in Eq. (17). Consequently, the distribution  $P[n]$  becomes concentrated on the (closed) line corresponding to  $[n] = \rho_\theta$  with  $\theta$  running from 0 to  $2\pi$ . Excepting exponentially rare events, the outcome of any experiment will correspond to a point in the close vicinity of this line, and consequently, an experiment will always show the interference picture as if the particles are condensed in a state with a certain definite phase difference  $\theta$  [3, 4].

It is well understood [3, 4, 5, 6, 7] that each experimental run results in a fringe image which corresponds to a well defined phase difference  $\theta$ , but its value is random when the experiment is repeated under identical conditions. Having at hand the full counting statistics of the interference image, we are able to go further into such an analysis and discuss the probability,  $p(\theta)$ , of the occurrence of the images corresponding to the phase  $\theta$ . Unlike

previous authors, we do not consider it *a priori* obvious that any value of  $\theta$  is equally probable as we are not aware of any physical symmetry that demands states with different phase difference  $\theta$  to be equivalent. On the contrary, we observe that the entropy of the partial distribution  $\mathcal{P}_\theta$  is  $\theta$ -dependent, [16] *i.e.*, the statistical weight of configurations to which a certain value of  $\theta$  can be assigned varies with  $\theta$ . Besides, there is no unique and unequivocal algorithm of the assignment, and the question warrants to be addressed. In general terms, this is a standard problem of mathematical statistics where one determines the parameters of a distribution from a sample data [11].

Specified a procedure  $\Theta[n]$  that assigns the phase difference  $\theta_{[n]} = \Theta[n]$  to a configuration  $[n]$ , [17] and given the occurrence frequency of the configurations  $P[n]$  in Eq. (15), the probability distribution  $p(\theta)$  is found as

$$p(\theta) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta'}{2\pi} W_{\theta'}(\theta) \quad (18)$$

where

$$W_{\theta'}(\theta) = \sum_{[n]} \delta(\theta - \theta_{[n]}) \mathcal{P}_{\theta'}[n] \quad (19)$$

is a function of  $\theta$ , normalised to unity, and with  $\theta'$  as parameter. For an unbiased estimator  $\Theta[n]$  [11], for which

$$\sum_{[n]} \Theta[n] \mathcal{P}_\theta[n] = \theta, \quad (20)$$

the function  $W$  is strongly peaked at  $|\theta - \theta'| \sim \sigma_{\theta'}$ , where the width of the peak,  $\sigma_{\theta'}$ , can be estimated from the Cramèr-Rao bound [11],

$$\sigma_{\theta'}^{-2} = \int d\mathbf{x} \rho_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \left( \frac{\partial \ln \rho_\theta(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \theta} \right)^2. \quad (21)$$

The physical meaning of the variance  $\sigma_\theta$  is that of the confidence ("the error bars") with which one is able to estimate the phase difference from a noisy image. By virtue of the normalization,  $\rho_\theta$  is proportional to the number of particles in the clouds so that the variance  $\sigma_\theta$  becomes small in the macroscopic limit. Note that the variance varies with  $\theta$  in agreement with the above discussion of the dependence of the statistical weight on the phase.

In the large- $N$  limit, the function  $W_{\theta'}(\theta)$  is a Gaussian,

$$W_{\theta'}(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_{\theta'}^2}} e^{-(\theta - \theta')^2 / 2\sigma_{\theta'}^2},$$

the normalisation property with respect to  $\theta$  follows from Eq. (19). Although the variance  $\sigma_{\theta'}$  is a function of the phase difference  $\theta'$ , in the integral with respect to  $\theta'$ , Eq. (18), one can safely replace  $\sigma_{\theta'} \rightarrow \sigma_\theta$ , after which the integral becomes a constant, and  $p(\theta) = 1/2\pi$  is independent of  $\theta$ . Thus, we see that the statistical inequivalence of the partial distributions  $\mathcal{P}_\theta$  is compatible with

the statement that an image of two overlapping condensates can be characterised by a phase difference  $\theta$ , the value of which in repeated experiments under identical conditions is equally probable in the interval  $0 < \theta < 2\pi$ .

Our approach allows us to evaluate the precision  $\delta\theta$  with which the phase difference may be meaningfully assigned to a noisy fringe image: Using Eq. (17), the width of the “error bars” given by  $\sigma_\theta$  in Eq. (21), can be expressed via the wave functions  $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$  of the interfering clouds:

$$\sigma_\theta^{-2} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} \frac{|\phi_1|^2 |\phi_2|^2 - \Re((e^{i\theta} \phi_1 \phi_2^*)^2)}{|\phi_1|^2 + |\phi_2|^2 + 2\Re(e^{i\theta} \phi_1 \phi_2^*)}. \quad (22)$$

For a simple illustration, we consider clouds which are initially in the ground states of 1D harmonic traps centered at  $x = \pm\Delta$ . After a free expansion during time  $\tau$ , the wave functions of the clouds are  $\phi_{1,2}(x) = \sqrt{N_{1,2}}/(a_\tau\sqrt{\pi}) \exp[-(x \pm \Delta)^2/(2aa_\tau)]$  where  $a_\tau = a + i\hbar\tau/(ma)$ ,  $m$  and  $a$  being the particle mass and initial width of the clouds, respectively. If the clouds overlap is small, *i.e.*,  $|a_\tau| < \Delta^2/a$  the uncertainty in the phase  $\delta\theta$  is estimated as  $\delta\theta \sim \sigma_\theta \sim \exp[\Delta^2/(2a|a_\tau|)]/(N_1N_2)^{1/4}$ . As no surprise, the uncertainty of the phase parameter  $\delta\theta \propto (N_1N_2)^{-1/4}$  is small provided  $N_{1,2}$  is large enough.

In this paper, we have presented a method which allows one to evaluate the probability of a local density configuration,  $[n] = n(\mathbf{x})$ , for a general many-body quantum state. The configurations are specified by a string of integers  $\{n_k\}$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \text{etc}$ , where the number at the  $k$ -th position is the number of particles located in the cell centered at position  $\mathbf{x}_k$ . The cells cover the relevant part of space, and the size of the cells defines the resolution of the density distribution. The probability of a density profile is expressed via the functional integral over the phase field  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ , Eq. (6) or Eq. (3), and the functional  $\Phi[\lambda(\mathbf{x})]$  defined by Eqs. (1) and (2). As usual in the probability generating function approach, the  $n$ -point correlation function can be obtained by taking the functional derivatives of the functional  $\Phi[\lambda(\mathbf{x})]$  with respect to  $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow 0$  at the corresponding  $n$  values of the co-ordinate  $\mathbf{x}$ . We have considered the case of only one species of particles, the generalisation to many species, bosons or fermions, is straightforward.

As an example, we have applied the method to the description of the interference experiment with ultra-cold atoms, where the quantum state is formed by two overlapping but initially separated clouds of Bose-Einstein condensates. We describe the condensates in the approximation of non-interacting bosons and, in particular, we ignore the condensate depletion. At the level of self-consistent description, the Gross-Pitaevskii theory, the interaction only modifies the evolution of the interfering waves  $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$  as discussed in [12]. Beyond the self-consistent approach, the most important effect of interaction is nontrivial spatial correlations in the noise of interfering BEC images (see Ref.[8] and references therein).

The density profile of the interfering matter waves generated by the two independent sources shows strong fluctuations, and the standard description of macroscopic systems in terms of the expectation value of the density and its low order, *e.g.* 2-point, correlators becomes insufficient. The “hidden” variable of interest is the parameter  $\theta$  which corresponds to the phase difference of the matter waves in the broken symmetry BEC-state, and this parameter can be extracted by analysing the density profile, *i.e.*, the CCD image registered in a snapshot experiment rather than from the expectation value found by averaging many such measurements. We have evaluated the probability for arbitrary density profile realisations as well as the probability distribution  $p(\theta)$  for the phase difference corresponding to these profiles. Supporting expectations of previous authors [3, 4, 5, 6, 7], we have found that the phase difference  $\theta$  is distributed uniformly for an unbiased procedure of assignment of  $\theta$  to the observed images.

In conclusion, we believe that the approach developed in this paper offers an efficient tool for a detailed analysis of the problem of interfering matter waves and gives new insight into this fundamental physical problem.

## Acknowledgments

One of us (J.R.) acknowledges financial support from the Swedish Research Council.

- 
- [1] M. Andrews *et al.*, Science **275**, 637 (1997), 10.1126/science.275.5300.637.
  - [2] P. W. Anderson, in *The Lessons of Quantum Theory*, edited by J. de Boer and O. Ulfbeck (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986).
  - [3] J. Javanainen and S. M. Yoo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 161 (1996).
  - [4] Y. Castin and J. Dalibard, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 4330 (1997).
  - [5] C. J. Pethick and H. Smith, *Bose-Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
  - [6] L. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, *Bose-Einstein Condensa-*

*tion* (Oxford University Press, 2003).

- [7] A. J. Leggett, *Quantum Liquids: Bose condensation and Cooper pairing in condensed-matter systems* (Oxford University Press, 2006).
- [8] A. Imambekov, V. Gritsev, and E. Demler, [cond-mat/0703766].
- [9] A. Shelankov and J. Rammer, Europhysics Letters **63**, 485 (2003).
- [10] M. Scully and M. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- [11] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information The-*

- ory (Wiley-Interscience New York, 1991).
- [12] G. S. Paraoanu, Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics) **77**, 041605 (2008).
- [13] We take for granted that the optical imaging apparatus used in the experiments displays the profile of the local density of atoms. The actual information gathered by a CCD camera is the column density of the atoms, which can be easily obtained from a 3D profile.
- [14] As implied in Eq. (7), we choose for calculational convenience the normalisation of the single-particle wave function to equal the number of condensed particles,  $N$ .
- [15] An  $N$ -fold enlargement of the original integration region of the phases is convenient to avoid technical problems with the functions  $e^{i\nu_{1,2}\theta}$  which are not  $2\pi$ -periodic.
- [16] The distribution  $\mathcal{P}_\theta[n]$ , Eq. (16), is generated by the product of independent Poissonian counts in the infinitesimal bins. The total entropy,  $S_\theta = -\sum_{[n]} \mathcal{P}_\theta[n] \ln \mathcal{P}_\theta$ , found as the sum with respect to the bins, equals  $S_\theta = -\int d\mathbf{x} \rho_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \ln \rho_\theta(\mathbf{x}) + \text{const.}$
- [17] For instance, one may use the assignment procedure where  $\theta_{[n]}$  is evaluated by minimising with respect to  $\theta$  the Euclidean distance,  $\int d\mathbf{x} (n(\mathbf{x}) - \rho_\theta(\mathbf{x}))^2$ , from a given input distribution  $n(\mathbf{x})$  to  $\rho_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ .