

# Coherence properties of an atom laser

Marek Trippenbach<sup>1</sup>, Y. B. Band<sup>1</sup>, Mark Edwards<sup>2</sup>, Marya Doery<sup>3</sup>, and P. S. Julienne<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Departments of Chemistry and Physics, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel 84105*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Physics, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30458-8031 USA*

<sup>3</sup> *National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive Stop 8423, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8423 USA*

(March 14, 2017)

## Abstract

We study the coherence properties of an atom laser, which operates by extracting atoms from a gaseous Bose-Einstein condensate via a two-photon Raman process, by analyzing a recent experiment [(Hagley *et al.*, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett. (1999)]. We obtain good agreement with the experimental data by solving the time-dependent Gross-Pitaevskii equation in three dimensions both numerically and with a Thomas-Fermi model. The coherence length is strongly affected by the space-dependent phase developed by the condensate when the trapping potential is turned off.

arXiv:cond-mat/9906033v1 2 Jun 1999

One of the most exciting prospects resulting from the Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC) of alkali vapors [1–3] is the possibility of producing an intense, coherent, and directed beam of matter waves, i.e., an atom laser. Indeed, prototype atom lasers have already been demonstrated [4,5]. Potential atom laser applications include time-and-frequency standards, atom holography, and nanolithography. A critical element in the operation of an atom laser is the “output coupler” by which atoms are coherently extracted from the condensate [6]. The design of this element is key to controlling the properties of the atom-laser beam [7]. At least two output-coupler mechanisms have been demonstrated. Condensate atoms have been extracted by rf magnetic pulses [8,9] and by two-photon Raman transitions [10]. A quasi-continuous atom laser was demonstrated recently [5] by using a rapid-fire sequence of laser pulses each of which caused condensate atoms to undergo a Raman transition that transferred momentum while simultaneously changing their internal state so that they were not trapped by the magnetic potential. Earlier theoretical studies of the properties of atom lasers [7,11], made no comparisons of theory and experiment. This paper examines the coherence properties of atom laser wavepackets by analyzing a recent NIST experiment [12] which probes such properties by measuring the decay of the interference contrast of two overlapping wavepackets outcoupled from a sodium atom condensate and separated by a variable delay time  $\Delta t$ .

A parent condensate with wavefunction  $\psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t_1)$  is prepared at time  $t_1$ . In one experiment the harmonic trapping potential was left on all the time, and we take  $t_1 = 0$ . In another experiment, the trapping potential was turned off and the condensate allowed to expand freely for up to  $t_1 = 5$  ms. A 100 ns standing-wave laser pulse was applied at time  $t_1$  with a wavelength  $\lambda_L = 589$  nm, detuned 600 MHz to the red of atomic resonance. This first laser pulse diffracts the condensate [10] to make two wavepackets  $\psi_1^\pm$  moving in the  $z$  direction with momenta  $\pm 2\mathbf{p}$ , where  $p = \hbar k = h/\lambda_L$ . We consider only the  $+2k$  wavepacket, since the problem is symmetric. At time  $t_2 = t_1 + \Delta t$ , the wavepacket evolves to

$$\psi_1^+(\mathbf{r}, t_2) = \phi_1(\mathbf{r} - \Delta\mathbf{z}, t_2) e^{i2kz} e^{-i\frac{4E_R}{\hbar}\Delta t}, \quad (1)$$

where  $E_R = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m}$  and  $m$  is the atomic mass. The slowly varying envelope function  $\phi_1$  is initially just a copy of the parent condensate wavefunction with norm  $|\alpha|^2 \ll 1$ :  $\phi_1(\mathbf{r}, t_1) = \alpha\psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t_1)$ . In the experiment  $|\alpha|^2 \approx 0.02$ , and the momentum spread of  $\psi_0$  is very small compared to  $2\hbar k$ . The first wavepacket moves  $\Delta\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{v}\Delta t$  in time  $t_2 - t_1$ , where  $v = 2\hbar k/m$  is the group velocity (60  $\mu\text{m}/\text{ms}$ ).

A second standing wave laser pulse at time  $t_2 = t_1 + \Delta t$  creates a second set of wavepackets  $\psi_2^\pm$ . The combined number of atoms in the  $+2k$  wavepacket is  $\langle |\psi_1^+ + \psi_2^+|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{r}}$ , where the brackets imply an integration over spatial coordinates. This fast  $+2k$  wavepacket soon clears the slowly expanding parent condensate and later can be imaged experimentally. The number of atoms in the  $+2k$  wavepacket is proportional to the following contrast function  $C(t_1, \Delta t)$ , defined so as to vary between 0 and 1:

$$\begin{aligned} C(t_1, \Delta t) &= \frac{1}{4} \left\langle \left| \frac{\phi_1(\mathbf{r} - \Delta\mathbf{z}, t_2)}{\alpha} e^{-i\frac{4E_R\delta t}{\hbar}} + \frac{\phi_2(\mathbf{r}, t_2)}{\alpha} \right|^2 \right\rangle_{\mathbf{r}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma(t_1, \Delta t). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The correlation function

$$\Gamma(t_1, \Delta t) = \text{Re} \left\langle \frac{e^{i\frac{4E_R\Delta t}{\hbar}} \phi_1^*(\mathbf{r} - \Delta\mathbf{z}, t_2) \phi_2(\mathbf{r}, t_2)}{|\alpha|^2} \right\rangle_{\mathbf{r}} \quad (3)$$

occurring in Eq. (2) relates two points separated by distance  $\Delta\mathbf{z}$  and provides a measure of the spatial and temporal coherence of both the parent condensate and the outcoupled wavepackets. In the hypothetical case that the moving packets are plane waves ( $\frac{\phi_1}{\alpha} = \frac{\phi_2}{\alpha} = 1$ ), then  $\Gamma(t_1, \Delta t) = \cos(4E_R\Delta t/\hbar)$  varies between +1 when the wavepackets remain in phase ( $4E_R\Delta t/\hbar = 2n\pi$  or  $\Delta t = n\tau$ , where  $\tau = \frac{\hbar}{4E_R} = 10 \mu\text{s}$  for Na atoms) and -1 when they are out of phase ( $\Delta t = (n + \frac{1}{2})\tau$ ). The two packets constructively and destructively interfere in these two respective cases, giving a contrast function  $C(t_1, \Delta t)$  which oscillates between 1 and 0 on a time scale of  $\Delta t = \tau/2$ . Actual condensate wavepackets of finite Thomas-Fermi radius  $z_{TF}$  in the  $z$ -direction will physically separate after times on the order of  $t_{TF} = 2z_{TF}/v$ , after which  $\Gamma \rightarrow 0$  and  $C(t_1, \Delta t) \rightarrow 1/2$ . Thus  $C(t_1, \Delta t)$  oscillates rapidly between 1 and 0 when  $\Delta t \ll t_{TF}$  and  $\Delta z \ll z_{TF}$ , and approaches  $\frac{1}{2}$  when  $\Delta t > t_{TF}$  and  $\Delta z > z_{TF}$ . We will see that when  $t_1$  is long enough that significant phase modulation has developed across the condensate due to the nonlinear mean field, then  $C(t_1, \Delta t)$  drops to  $\frac{1}{2}$  in a time short compared to  $t_{TF}$ .

In the NIST experiment, the harmonic trap had frequencies  $\frac{\omega}{2\pi}$  of 14 Hz,  $28/\sqrt{2}$  Hz, and 28 Hz in the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  directions respectively, and a mean frequency of  $\frac{\bar{\omega}}{2\pi} = 28/\sqrt{2}$  Hz. If the parent condensate has 1,500,000 atoms,  $z_{TF}(x) = 22 \mu\text{m}$  and  $t_{TF} = 740 \mu\text{s}$ . The characteristic time for developing phase modulation (i.e., momentum spread) across the condensate is  $1/\bar{\omega} = 8$  ms. The experimental  $t_1$  varied from 0 to 5 ms, and  $\Delta t$  from 0 to around 500  $\mu\text{s}$ . Wavepacket images were taken about 6 ms after  $t_1$ , long after the fast wavepacket has cleared the stationary, slowly expanding parent condensate. The number of atoms in the  $\pm 2k$  wavepackets could be counted using such images.

In order to provide a reference normalization to remove errors incurred by shot-to-shot fluctuations in the total number of condensate atoms, since a new condensate had to be made to measure the contrast for each delay time, the NIST experiment actually utilized a second pair of standing wave pulses to produce a new set of  $\pm 2k$  wavepackets. The first pulse of the second pair was applied at time  $t_3 = t_1 + 3\text{ms}$ , after the fast wavepackets from the pulse pair at  $(t_1, t_2)$  have moved away from the parent condensate. The second pulse of the second pair was applied at  $t_4 = t_3 + \Delta t + \tau/2$ , where  $\tau/2 = 5\mu\text{s}$ . Thus, when  $\Delta t \ll t_{TF}$ , the contrast function  $C_2(t_3, \Delta t + \tau/2)$  for the second pulse pair is exactly out of phase with the contrast function  $C_1(t_1, \Delta t)$  for the first pulse pair. The experimental images separately determine the number of atoms in the  $\pm 2k$  wavepackets from the  $(t_1, t_2)$  and the  $(t_3, t_4)$  pulse pairs. The necessity to provide a normalization of the number of atoms each packet from shot to shot is avoided in the experiment by reporting as the “signal” the function

$$S(t_1, t_3, \Delta t) = \frac{C_1(t_1, \Delta t)}{C_1(t_1, \Delta t) + C_2(t_3, \Delta t + \tau/2)} \quad (4)$$

Just like  $C$ , the signal  $S$  oscillates rapidly between 0 and 1 for  $\Delta t \ll t_{TF}$  and approaches  $\frac{1}{2}$  when  $\Delta t > t_{TF}$ . We can define a “coherence time”  $\Delta t_c$  to be the time for the envelope of the signal function  $S$  to decay halfway from its  $\Delta t = 0$  value of 1 to its long time limiting value of  $\frac{1}{2}$ , that is,  $S(t_1, t_3, \Delta t_c) = 0.75$ . A corresponding “coherence length” is  $\Delta z_c = v\Delta t_c$ .

The time-dependent Gross-Pitaevskii (TDGP) equation describes the dynamics of  $\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ , which includes the parent condensate plus the fast  $\pm 2k$  wavepackets:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) + (V_{\text{trap}}(\mathbf{r}, t) + V_{\text{laser}}(\mathbf{r}, t)) \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) + U_0 N |\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 \psi(\mathbf{r}, t), \quad (5)$$

where  $U_0 = 4\pi\hbar^2 a/m$ ,  $a$  is the  $s$ -wave scattering length,  $N$  is the total number of condensate atoms and  $V_{\text{trap}}(\mathbf{r}, t)$  is the trapping potential. The contrast functions  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  can be calculated from  $\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ . The interaction of condensate atoms with the four standing-wave laser pulses can be written as

$$V_{\text{laser}}(\mathbf{r}, t) = V_L \cos(2\mathbf{k}_L \cdot \mathbf{r}) \sum_{n=1}^4 f(t - t_n, \delta t), \quad (6)$$

where  $V_L f(t, \delta t)$  is the single laser pulse envelope. The laser pulse duration  $\delta t = 100$  ns is short compared to  $\Delta t$ . The factors  $t_n$  are the times at which the four experimental pulses are applied.

The modification to the condensate wavefunction caused by a short-time, low-intensity, standing-wave laser pulse can be best understood in momentum space. Before the first pulse, there is only a component centered at  $\mathbf{p} = 0$ . We can use time-dependent perturbation theory to show that sidebands appear after the pulse at  $\mathbf{p} = \pm 2\hbar\mathbf{k}$ . For our experimental conditions, it can be shown that these sidebands have the same shape as the  $\mathbf{p} = 0$  component and have amplitude proportional to the pulse area. At short time  $\epsilon$  immediately after the  $n$ -th pulse,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{r}, t_n + \epsilon) \approx & \psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t_n) - \frac{i}{2\hbar} V_L \mathcal{A}(\delta t) \\ & \times [e^{2i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} + e^{-2i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}] \psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t_n). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The pulse is applied to the parent condensate at time  $t_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , where the parent condensate wavefunction has evolved from  $t_1$  to  $t_n$ . The laser pulse area,  $V_L \mathcal{A}(\delta t)$ , is the area under the single laser pulse appearing in Eq. (6), and  $V_L \mathcal{A}/\hbar \ll 1$  in the experiments. After normalization, the wavepacket in Eq. (7) serves as the initial condition for subsequent evolution.

We have used two different methods to evolve  $\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ . The first is a numerical propagation of the three-dimensional (3D) solution to the TDGP equation, using a fast-Fourier-transform method with the slowly-varying-envelope approximation to reduce the size of the spatial grid. The slowly varying envelope approximation is excellent here because the momentum spread of  $\psi_0$  is very small compared to  $2\hbar k$ . We have verified that this methodology, which will be described in detail elsewhere, gives excellent agreement with full numerical solutions of the TDGP equation in one- and two-dimensions. This allows us to calculate exact contrast functions for a zero temperature condensate for any time sequence of trapping potential and laser pulses.

We have also calculated the contrast functions using a second approximate method which we call the time-dependent Thomas-Fermi (TDTF) method. Let us first consider the case when the trapping potential is turned off at  $t = 0$  prior to the first pulse at  $t_1$ . Once  $V_{\text{trap}}$  is removed, the parent condensate,  $\psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t)$ , evolves freely, develops phase modulation

and expands somewhat. The 3D form of  $\psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t)$  can be easily found since, for expanding condensates where the TF approximation is valid, the solution of the TDGP is self-similar, i.e., it can be transformed to its original shape (before release) by suitable axis scalings. The time dependence of the scale parameters has been shown [13] to obey coupled nonlinear ordinary differential equations. Once the atoms in high momentum states clear the  $\mathbf{p} = 0$  condensate, they evolve as free particles (if  $V_L \mathcal{A}/\hbar \ll 1$ ) and move with velocity  $\pm 2\hbar \mathbf{k}/m$ . In our 3D model, the full condensate wavefunction thus evolves after the passage of the first pulse as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) \approx & \psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t) - \frac{i}{2\hbar} V_L \mathcal{A}(\delta t) e^{-i4E_R(t-t_1)/\hbar} \\ & \times \left[ e^{2i\mathbf{k}_L \cdot \mathbf{r}} \psi_0(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{v}(t-t_1), t_1) \right. \\ & \left. + e^{-2i\mathbf{k}_L \cdot \mathbf{r}} \psi_0(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{v}(t-t_1), t_1) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Using Eqs. (7) and (8) we can develop the condensate wavefunction for any number of pulses and delays. When the trap is left on, the only modification to the above analysis is that the  $\mathbf{p} = 0$  condensate does not develop phase or expand.

Fig. 1 compares the calculated results for  $S(t_1, t_3, \Delta t)$  with the NIST data [12] for the case where the trap was held on. In each panel the experimental signal is plotted against the delay  $\Delta t$  used for the first pair of pulses. The signal was measured for  $\Delta t$  in 1  $\mu\text{s}$  increments up to  $\Delta t = 50 \mu\text{s}$  after which the increment was 30  $\mu\text{s}$  up to  $\Delta t = 530 \mu\text{s}$ . Fig. 1a shows excellent agreement with the short time data, which was normalized to unity at the first peak at 10  $\mu\text{s}$ . The TDGP and TDTF calculations also agree well, except that the phase of the latter slightly lags that of the former because of the small acceleration of the fast wavepackets by the effective potential provided by the parent condensate. The long-time evolution of the signal envelope agrees very well between the TDGP and TDTF calculations. The coherence time  $\Delta t_c$  predicted by the two models, around 275  $\mu\text{s}$ , is slightly longer than the measured value of  $225 \pm 40 \mu\text{s}$ . When the trap is on, the decay of  $S(t_1, \Delta t)$  is simply due to the reduction of the time-dependent overlap of the moving outcoupled wavepackets. Consequently, the calculated and measured coherence lengths,  $\Delta z_c = v\Delta t_c = 17 \mu\text{m}$  and 14  $\mu\text{m}$  respectively, are an appreciable fraction of the size of the parent condensate,  $z_{TF} = 22 \mu\text{m}$ . This also implies that coherence extends across most of the size of the outcoupled wavepackets. This result is in line with a recent estimate of the coherence length of a static condensate using Bragg spectroscopy [14].

Fig. 2 compares the experimental data for  $S(t_1, t_3, \Delta t)$  with the TDGP and TDTF calculations for two cases for which the trap was turned off at  $t = 0$ . In Fig. 2a  $(t_1, t_3) = (1.2\text{ms}, 4.2\text{ms})$ , whereas in Fig. 2b,  $(t_1, t_3) = (5\text{ms}, 8\text{ms})$ . The agreement between the two calculations, as well as the agreement between experiment and theory, is good for both cases. The coherence times and lengths are much smaller for these trap-off cases than for the trap-on case in Fig. 1. For Fig. 2a the respective TDGP and TDTF  $\Delta t_c$  are 82 and 80  $\mu\text{s}$  as compared to  $65 \pm 10 \mu\text{s}$  for the experiment. For Fig. 2b the corresponding theoretical values of 38  $\mu\text{s}$  and 37  $\mu\text{s}$  compare with a measured value of  $45 \pm 10 \mu\text{s}$ . The respective coherence lengths for the (1.2ms, 4.2ms) and (5ms, 8ms) cases are 5  $\mu\text{m}$  and 2  $\mu\text{m}$ , much smaller than  $z_{TF}$ . Since  $\Delta z_c$  is substantially smaller than the condensate size, there must be another source of coherence loss than wavepacket separation.

The extra source of coherence loss when the trap is off is due to the particle interactions that give rise to the nonlinear term in the GP equation. When the trap potential is removed, the parent condensate experiences the effective potential  $NU_0|\psi_0|^2$ , which causes phase modulation to develop across the condensate. This is due to the increased spread in the condensate momentum distribution as the atoms accelerate. For example, Fig. 1 of Ref. [12] shows the spatial oscillations in  $\text{Re}\psi_0$  and  $\text{Im}\psi_0$  due to this phase modulation. The presence of these oscillations in  $\psi_0(\mathbf{r}, t)$  spoil the phase matching when packet 1 is translated by  $\Delta z$  during the interval  $\Delta t$ , and lead to a much faster loss of coherence between the packets than for the trap-on case. The longer  $t_1$  is, the greater the coherence loss will be. Since the characteristic time scale to reach terminal momentum spread is  $1/\bar{\omega} = 8$  ms, much coherence loss is to be expected for the example in Fig. 2b.

In conclusion, outcoupled wavepacket coherence times and lengths predicted by a three-dimensional time-dependent Thomas Fermi model are in excellent agreement with those calculated from solution of the three-dimensional TDGP equation and also give good agreement with data from a recent experiment which measured coherence properties of Raman-outcoupled atom laser wavepackets. Since the outcoupled wavepackets are copies of the parent condensate, the experiment probes both the coherence of the parent condensate as well as that of the outcoupled wavepackets. Spatial and temporal coherence is maintained across the parent condensate while the trap is left on, but is rapidly lost when the trap is turned off due to phase modulation which develops across the condensate.

This work was supported by the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation, the James Franck Binational German-Israel Program in Laser-Matter Interaction (YBB) and the Office of Naval Research and by NSF grant no. PHY-9802547. The authors would like to acknowledge stimulating discussions with L. Deng, E.W. Hagley, C.W. Clark, S.L. Rolston, K. Helmerson, W.D. Phillips, and K. Burnett. A special thanks is due to the NIST (Gaithersburg) laser cooling group for providing data in advance of publication.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M.H. Anderson, J.R. Ensher, M.R. Matthews, C.E. Wieman, and E.A. Cornell, *Science* **269**, 198 (1995).
- [2] K.B. Davis, M.-O. Mewes, M.R. Andrews, N.J. van Druten, D.S. Durfee, D.M. Kurn, and W. Ketterle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3969 (1995).
- [3] C.C. Bradley, C.A. Sackett, and R.G. Hulet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 985 (1997); see also C.C. Bradley, C.A. Sackett, J.J. Tollett, and R.G. Hulet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1687 (1995);
- [4] M.R. Andrews, C.G. Townsend, H.-J. Miesner, D.S. Durfee, D.M. Kurn, and W. Ketterle, *Science* **275**, 637 (1997)
- [5] E. W. Hagley, L. Deng, M. Kozuma, J. Wen, K. Helmerson, S. L. Rolston, and W. D. Phillips, *Science* **283**, 1706 (1999).
- [6] Y.B. Band, M. Trippenbach and P.S. Julienne, *Phys. Rev.* **A59**, 3823 (1999); Y. Japha, S. Choi, K. Burnett and Y. B. Band, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1079 (1999).
- [7] M. Edwards, D.A. Griggs, P.L. Holman, C.W. Clark, S.L. Rolston, and W.D. Phillips, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. and Opt. Phys.*, (in press.)
- [8] M.-O. Mewes, M.R. Andrews, D.M. Kurn, D.S. Durfee, C.G. Townsend, and W. Ketterle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 582 (1997).
- [9] I. Bloch, T. W. Hänsch, and T. Esslinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3008 (1999).
- [10] M. Kozuma, L. Deng, E. W. Hagley, J. Wen, R. Lutwak, K. Helmerson, S. L. Rolston, and W. D. Phillips, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 871 (1999).
- [11] R.J. Ballagh, K. Burnett, and T.F. Scott, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** 1607 (1997); M. Naraschewski, A. Schenzle, and H. Wallis, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 603 (1997); H. Steck, M. Naraschewski, and H. Wallis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1 (1998).
- [12] E.W. Hagley, L. Deng, M. Kozuma, K. Helmerson, S.L. Rolston, and W.D. Phillips, accompanying paper.
- [13] Yu. Kagan, B.V. Svistunov, and G.V. Shlyapnikov, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, R1753 (1996); Y. Castin and R. Dum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 5315 (1996); Yu. Kagan, E.L. Surkov, and G.V. Shlyapnikov, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, R18 (1997).
- [14] J. Stenger, S. Inouye, A.P. Chikkatur, D.M. Stamper-Kurn, D.E. Pritchard, and W. Ketterle, (unpublished, cond-mat/9901109.)

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. Comparison of calculated TDGP (solid line) and TDTF (dashed line) and experimental (points) signal functions  $S(t_1 = 0, t_3 = 3ms, \Delta t)$  versus  $\Delta t$  for the case where the trap with 1,500,000 atoms was held on during the laser-pulse firings. (a) Comparison during the first 50  $\mu s$  where the delay was stepped in increments of 1  $\mu s$ . (b) Comparison of the TDGP signal with the measured signal envelope over the full delay range to 500  $\mu s$ . The TDTF model gives essentially the same envelope.

FIG. 2. Comparison of TDGP (solid line) and TDTF (dashed line) signal functions  $S(t_1, t_3, \Delta t)$  with the data (points) for the case where the trap potential was turned off at  $t = 0$ . (a)  $(t_1, t_3 = (1.2ms, 4.2ms))$  for 500,000 atoms in the trap. (b)  $(t_1, t_3) = (5ms, 8ms)$  for 2,500,000 atoms in the trap.





